AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—SEPTEMBER, 1892.—NO. 3.

DARWINISM AND THEISM.

EVOLUTION of organisms from a common ancestor is one of those conceptions that belong to the armory of modern thought alone. Mediaeval theology, therefore, which left no quarter untouched lying within its range and grasp, had no opportunity of discussing this all-important subject on its own merits. Although St. Augustine in some of his writings took a delight in evolutionary ideas, still there are many good reasons to doubt whether he ever took the modern principle of a common descent into any serious consideration, as his utterances referring to specific organization seem to bear witness to his belief rather in the fixity than in the mutability of species.[1] Theology then stands nowadays face to face with a new problem, which offers an opportunity to prove to the world that she is as little committed to a certain narrow-mindedness as to a headless and iniquitous radicalism.

I do not stop here to consider the question of the truth or falsity of the theory of Mr. Darwin.[2] No matter whether sober-minded

1 Cf. *St. August.* De genesi ad lit. v, 45; de Trinitate iii, 8; de genesi ad lit. lib. imperf., cc. x. xi. xv. xix. See *Dr. C. Guttler*, Lorenz Oken und sein Verhältniss zur modernen Entwickelungslehre p. 10 ff. Leipzig. 1884.

2 The best refutation of Darwinism that has yer appeared is to be found in the great work, in three volumes, of the late *Dr. Albert Wigand*, Professor of Botany at the University of Marburg, with the title "Der Darwinismus und die Naturforschung Newtons u. Cuviers." Braunschweig 1874-1877. *Hugo Spitzer* in his "Beitrage zur Descendenzlehre" tried in vain to demolish his arguments, except for some particulars of minor importance. The weakest point in Wigand's valuable work seems to lie in his insisting too much on the fixity of species, a conception which, in the present state of science, ought not any longer to be urged in a sense too exclusive and rigid. Among English books devoted to the refutation of Darwinism, besides the different writings of *Professor Dr. St. George Mivart* ("Genesis of Species," "Lessons from Nature," "Men and Apes," "On Truth," "The Origin of Human Reason"), may be consulted with profit: *C. R. Bree*, "Fallacies in the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin"; London 187, and especially, *David Syme*, on the modification of organisms, London 1891.

Woodstock College 6-27-123

scientists may favor or disfavor his views, my only intention here will be to examine whether Darwinism be in its very nature godless, irreligious and atheistical, or whether its principles when carried to their ultimate logical consequences necessarily and irretrievably lead us to the denial of a personal God, and thus land us on the shores of atheism and agnosticism. To put the same question in a more concrete and intelligible shape: Would a Catholic, who feels strongly inclined to accept the doctrine of Darwinism on its own merits and influenced by purely scientific considerations, be nevertheless bound in conscience to reject it, as a theist, or as a Christian, or as a Catholic? Can a true Catholic be at the same time both a faithful son of the Church and a disciple of Darwin? The question is not only delicate, but of great practical importance.

Now I am very well aware of the fact that not only divines of first note, but also renowned philosophers and naturalists who have kept the treasure of their faith through the storms of life, have taken a rather gloomy and pessimistic view on this point, arraigning Darwinism openly for irreligious and atheistic tendencies. Dr. P. Schanz, in his 'Christian Apology' writes thus:

"Catholics and Protestants * * * * * believe that in adopting the Darwinian theory lies the surest way to convince opponents that it does not contradict faith. Darwinism, they declare, is contrary to faith only when it is misinterpreted and misunderstood. Far from excluding a First Cause, they say, Darwinism imperatively demands it. My view is not quite so optimistic. I think I have shown that Darwinism would exclude a First Cause if it could." [1]

In a similar strain Father Thomas Hughes, S. J., expresses himself:

"Under the scientific form of Darwinism, around which as a quickening nucleus the whole theory of evolution has gathered, we find naturalism or materialism acquiring such an ascendancy that every science now pays tribute to it." [2]

And the distinguished geologist of Canada, Sir I. W. Dawson, sees fit to make the following remark:

"It is true that many evolutionists, either unwilling to offend, or not perceiving the logical consequences of their own hypothesis, endeavor to steer a middle course, and to maintain that the Creator has proceeded by way of evolution. But the bare, hard logic of

1 *Dr. P. Schanz*, A Christian Apology. Vol. 1, p. 194, New York, 1891.
2 *Fr. Hughes*, Principles of Anthropology and Biology, New York, 1890, p. 18.

Spencer, the greatest English authority on evolution, leaves no place for this compromise, and shows that the theory, carried to its legitimate consequences, excludes the knowledge of a Creator and the possibility of His work. We have, therefore, to choose between evolution and creation." [1]

In rejoinder to all these misgivings and pessimistic views, I feel bound to confess that I never could prevail upon myself to believe that Darwinism contains nothing short of a hotbed of infidelity and iniquity brought into a system, and is, therefore irreconcilable on principle with a sincere and pious belief in a First Cause and a Designer of the world. The venerable and learned *Dr. McCosh* hits the mark when he says, in reference to the present state of things:

"The great body of naturalists, all younger than forty, certainly all younger than thirty, are sure that they see evolution in Nature; but they are assured by their teachers or the religious press that, if evolution does everything, there is nothing left for God to do, and they see no proof of His existence. Many a youth is brought to a crisis in his belief and life by such a representation. He feels that he must give up either his science or his faith, and his head is distracted and his heart is tortured, till feelings more bitter than tears are wrung from him." [2]

If this earnest plea of one of our best Christian men is not entirely unfounded, and if, on the other hand, it can hardly be gainsaid that the bulk of those who believe in evolution know of it only in the shape of "natural selection" as pronounced by Darwin, would it not on our part be an uncalled-for act of foolish suicide if we were to drive those unfortunate victims of prejudice away from the ever decreasing flock of faithful believers, on the shallow plea that the only choice is between theism and Darwinism, between belief and

1 *Sir J. W. Dawson.* The Story of the Earth and Men p. 321, New York, 1887. In another place the same author remarks: "We have already seen that the doctrine (of evolution), as carried out to its logical consequences, excludes creation and theism. It may, however, be shown that even in its more modified forms, and when held by men who maintain that they are not atheists, it is practically atheistic, because excluding the idea of plan and design, and resolving all things into the action of unintelligent forces" (op. cit. p. 348). See also *Dawson's* Modern Ideas of Evolution as related to Revelation and Science p. 227, London, 1890. It is interesting to compare with this crushing judgment the contrary statement of *Dr. C. Gutller*, a Catholic writer of first note, who says: "Darwin hat weder den Schöpfungsbegriff, noch auch den Begriff der Endzwecke eliminirt, sondern er hat beide nur veredelt, er hat nach der Prophezie Kant's mechanische Vorgange als die causalen Principien der Transmutation hervorgesucht, aber damit die Theleologie nicht beseitigt, sondern nur zurückgeschoben" (Lorenz Oken u. sein Verhaltniss zur modernen Entwickelungslehre p. 129, Leipzig 1884). Could there be a wider difference of opinion between two Christian thinkers?

2 *Dr. McCosh*, "The Religious Aspect of Evolution," p. 5. New York, 1890.

unbelief; that he who embraces the one has to give up and denounce the other; that "natural selection" is incompatible with design and purpose; that "the survival of the fittest" is exclusive of a Creator and Designer. From a purely pedagogic standpoint such conduct should appear in the highest degree objectionable and imprudent.

True it is that prudence dares not go so far as to prompt willingness in yielding to deleterious error, or to advise a reckless acceptance of evident and palpable falsehoods. But I think that we can furnish ample proof of the fact that even Darwinian principles can logically be pushed to their ultimate issues without dashing at each pace in opposition to the Maker and Designer of all things. To demonstrate and substantiate this statement by philosophical arguments constitutes the main object of this paper.

Darwinism may be viewed from a two-fold standpoint: 1st. As a *scientific hypothesis*, meant to explain the origin of specific types and drawing its proofs only from the facts and suggestions of Nature itself. 2d. As a *philosophical system*, calculated to explain the phenomena of organic life only by natural selection and other secondary agencies, to the exclusion of a First Cause. Now it is obvious from the outset that Darwinism, when looked at in the light of physical science alone, can never come into any conflict with religion, either natural or Christian. For neither theism nor Christianity are likely to take the slightest interest in the purely scientific question whether organic species are fixed or changeable, whether those supposed or real specific changes have been and are still being produced by natural selection (Darwin), or by external life conditions (Geoffrey St. Hilaire), or by some innate power (Mivart, Wigand), or by heterogenesis (Kœlliker), or by some other yet unknown working method of Nature, provided only that man be not included, body and soul, in the whole evolutionary process, and thus be degraded into a mere brute, however highly developed.[1] Religion, therefore, as it has no business, so it has no interest whatsoever, to settle the controversies and problems of science as such. In this, then, science itself must and will be recognized as the only competent judge. But more still. As we shall prove hereafter, Darwinism, if considered as a strictly scientific hypothesis, does not only not clash with theism, but naturally tends to land us straightway in theism.

1 To this most important item, *Mr. Mivart* devotes his admirable book "The Origin of Human Reason" (London, 1889) written against *G. T. Romanes*, "Mental Evolution in Man: Origin of Human Faculty" (London, 1888).

But if Darwinism were to deem it proper to outstep its boundary lines, and to pose and strut before the world as a confirmatory evidence of atheism, agnosticism, monism, pantheism and the like, it would of course assume at once an uncalled-for threatening attitude against religion, and thus become itself irreligious,—not of itself, it is true, yet verily so, although only accidentally.

Now I say (1) Darwinism, when putting on atheistic or agnostic clothes and thus expanding into a philosophic system, must of necessity fail in its endeavors to oust God from the world as the work of His own hands; (2) Darwinism, when keeping within the proper limits of a scientific hypothesis, far from disparaging and imperilling the cause of theism, proves rather a safe and reliable guide to the acknowledgment of God.

As far as the first question is concerned, there can be no doubt that a great many Darwinists of the present age have actually become atheists, agnostics, materialists, etc., on the plea that the light of evolution has shone forth so brightly as to supersede a First Cause, as to eliminate a Designer, as to do away with a Creator of all things. Mr. Darwin himself, in his autobiography, written in 1876 (Life and Letters, Vol. 1, page 311), gives expression to his misgivings as follows :

"Another source of conviction in the existence of God, connected with the reason and not with the feelings, impresses me as having much more weight. This follows from the extreme difficulty or rather impossibility of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man, with his capacity of looking far forward and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity.

"When thus reflecting I feel impelled to look to a First Cause, having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man, and I deserve to be called a theist. This conclusion was strong in my mind about the time, as far as I can remember, when I wrote the "Origin of Species," and it is since that time that it has very gradually, with many fluctuations, become weaker. But then arises the doubt, can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such grand conclusions? I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us, and I for one must be content to remain an agnostic."

Before refuting this argument, it will be well to bear in mind that Mr. Darwin was a very good man, a perfect gentleman, an excel-

lent scientist, but, at the same time, a bad philosopher. He himself acknowledges this in a letter addressed to Prof. Asa Gray, wherein he says: "I have had no practice in abstract reasoning, and I may be all astray." In the passage just quoted we have the statement of a difficulty, and an indication of the source from which that difficulty takes its origin. The difficulty consists in the expression of his doubts as to the trustworthiness of the human reason when drawing such grand conclusions as that of a First Cause; the source of the difficulty, however, is found in the firm conviction of Mr. Darwin that the human mind does not essentially differ from the mind of the lowest animals, *e. g.*, the amœbæ and infusoria, from which man has been gradually evolved.

It is, however, an easy task to discard both assumptions as evidently untenable and absurd. To doubt the trustworthiness of our reason amounts to pulling down the very pillars of all certitude, and sapping the roots of all philosophical and scientific research.[1] Universal skepticism, the death of all science, must be the inevitable result of this position. Darwin then would, for his own consistency's sake, be bound to cast overboard not only his belief in a First Cause, but also his conviction of the origin of the human mind from the brutes, his belief in the efficiency of natural selection. In both cases his conclusions must prove equally untrustworthy on the same grounds. His books then, in this case, had better have remained unwritten, and he might, with the same right, have called into doubt his own existence as well as that of the First Cause.

But a greater blunder perhaps does he commit when he proceeds unhesitatingly to trace the human mind back to the lowest animals.

We can meet this issue by the following dilemma: Either the mind of the beasts can do some reasoning from first principles as man can, whose mind is said not to differ essentially from theirs; or the mind of beasts is altogether deprived of the power of reasoning. In the first case, the "bestial reasoning" with reference to the existence of a First Cause must be as sound and as trustworthy as that of man himself; for first principles are objectively immutable, and the same of all minds throughout all space and time. In the second case, however, an absolute and specific difference between the human and animal mind is established, since the former is able to reason and the latter is not. The power of reasoning evidently implies a spirit, transcending in its activities and essence the sphere

1 See *Father John Rickaby S. J.* "The First Principles of Knowledge" p. 134-183. New York, 1889.

of mere animality. But then let us infer also that the mind of man cannot possibly have derived its origin from the brutes. The mistake of Mr. Darwin then is plain. He has neither shaken nor weakened the evidence for a First Cause, unless he be willing, either to surrender to absolute skepticism, which means the death and downfall of his own theory as well as of all truth, or to give himself up to materialism, which pulls down the partition wall that is set up between human reason and animal intelligence. Both kinds of philosophy, however, if they ever should be honored with that name can be proved to evidence to be false and untenable. Therefore in vain must prove the efforts of those who try to do away with a First Cause.

No less great is the confusion and muddle caused by some Darwinists when they turn their weapons against Creator and creation. They appear to be of opinion that natural agencies may by themselves satisfactorily account for all specific origination, and that thus a Creative Cause has become entirely superfluous. Each organic species came into existence, not by an act of creative will, but by the agencies and factors of evolution. In the fifth edition of his "Origin of Species" Mr. Darwin somewhat sarcastically asks his opponents whether they believe "that, at innumerable periods in the earth's history, certain elemental atoms have been commanded suddenly to flash into living tissues" (p. 571). Still more outspoken appears Darwin's German translator, *H. G. Bron*, who, in a notice of the German edition, says:

"If a personal act of creation be really necessary at all, it matters but little whether the first creative act has been concerned with but one species or with ten or with 100,000, and likewise whether it has accomplished all this once for ever, or repeated itself from time to time. The question is not, how many organisms have been called by God into being, but whether it can ever become a matter of necessity that He should interfere at all. * * * * * If Mr. Darwin is going to attack organic creation in general, then he is compelled to give up also the creation of the first algae."

Here then we come face to face with an attempt to eliminate the Creator, on the worn-out pretext that the principles of Darwinism seem to be sufficient to account, not only for the further development of given species, but also for their first origin.

But the wonder is how thinking men could have suffered themselves to be led astray so far from the path of common sense. A gross misunderstanding, and a sad confusion of ideas underlies

this whole reasoning. To first clear the way of the incumbrances piled up before us, let us above all with Mr. Mivart distinguish between the different significations attached to the word "creation."

1. In the strictest and highest sense creation is the absolute origination of anything by God without pre-existing means or material, and is a supernatural act.

2. In the secondary and lower sense creation is the formation of anything by God derivatively; that is, by the creation of the preceding matter with the potentiality of evolving from itself, under suitable conditions, all the various forms it subsequently assumes. This potentiality having been conferred by God in the first instance, and those laws and forces having been instituted by Him through the action of which the suitable conditions are supplied, He is said, in this lower sense, to create such various subsequent forms. This is the natural action of God in the physical world, as distinguished from His direct, or, as it may be here called, supernatural action.[1]

This distinction between absolute and derivative creation once thoroughly grasped and constantly kept in view, it is easily seen that the attacks of some Darwinists against creation are simply founded on a misnomer. What sort of a creation do they object to? Is it absolute and primary creation? Or is it derivative and secondary creation? If they mean to assail the former, how, then, can they hope to score a success, since physical science is absolutely impotent to prove or to disprove such a doctrine as that of the first origins. If, however, they intend to combat against derivative creation, then they obviously commit an act of great foolishness, as the very process of evolution they so eagerly advocate coincides with derivative creation itself in the sense explained above. In brief: The doctrine of absolute creation is a question of metaphysics, which Darwinism with its principles is incapable of deciding in either way: while the doctrine of derivative creation *is nothing else than the Darwinian doctrine itself*, put into its proper and natural shape and interpreted in the very same manner as Mr. Darwin himself did in the first editions of his "Origin of Species." In both cases, therefore, the rights of theism are sufficiently maintained.

Nor can the safe position of theism be imperiled by Darwin's challenge addressed to his opponents—a challenge which looks much like an appeal to the *odium theologicum*—viz., that they should try to explain specific origination in a way different from that

1. *St. George Mivart*, "Genesis of Species," p. 267 f.

of the popular belief that "at innumerable periods in the earth's history, certain elemental atoms have been commanded suddenly to flash into living tissues." After all, we are still quietly waiting for the proofs to show that such an origin would be either physically impossible or logically absurd. God's ways are not the ways of man, and it would be an unendurable arrogance on our part to prescribe to God the methods of His working. But the truth in this matter is that even many believers in divine creation do not at all cherish this sort of explanation, it being now admitted, almost on all sides, that derivative creation may, if need be, be extended even to the first origin of the first organism—a doctrine which *St. Augustine*, for example, has admirably embodied in his grand theory of the "rationes seminales," and according to which God in the first instance is believed to have conferred on matter the special and specific power of producing life as soon as the conditions of its existence and maintenance became suitable. Whichever side, however, we may take in this issue, one thing remains certain beyond the possibility of a doubt, viz., that Darwinism cannot from its own principles alone account for the first origin of the first living beings. Forsooth, the main, and, according to Weismann and Wallace, the sole agency of Darwinism is "natural selection in the struggle for existence." Now, as natural selection evidently presupposes the existence of living material to select from and to seize upon and to work with, it is plain that it can apply only to a further development of what already exists, and cannot therefore be extended to the first origination itself. We are told over and over again, it is true, that by virtue of "autobiogenesis" or "spontaneous generation" first life must have made its appearance upon earth. Not by divine command, but by chance, "certain elemental atoms" are believed to "flash into living tissues." What a pity it is that modern science itself has demolished those beautiful dreams of spontaneous generation, and has irrevocably established the great fact that living beings originate but from other living beings, and that dead matter cannot of itself "flash" into life!

"Such philosophers" to quote from an ably written article in the *Athenaeum*— "as prefer still to remain materialists set their faces against science and experience. The sole argument by which they attempt to justify themselves is perhaps the most extraordinary instance of a *reductio ad absurdum* that has ever been presented to the mind of man. The hypothesis of spontaneous generation must be accepted, since without it, says Burmeister, the appearance of

organic life upon the earth could only be explained by the immediate operation of a higher power. If science, says Büchner, found itself obliged to admit a vital force * * * we should have to admit the intervention of a higher hand. In short we must, according to these writers, avow, no matter how strong the evidences to the contrary may be, that life is capable of a purely mechanical or purely chemical interpretation, or else we shall be driven to the absurdity of believing in the existence of God.[1]

Some scientists then are unwilling to accept the dogma of creation : still they have to resort instead to another dogma of their own,—the dogma of spontaneous generation, in which, willing or unwilling, they must believe with implicit faith, in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, since science positively rejects the tenet. There is then this curious difference between the believer in creation and the devotees of "autobiogenesis" that the former can prove their faith to be comformable not only to the teaching of Christianity, but also to the principles of logic and sound philosophy, whereas the latter have necessarily to believe in a doctrine which is not only absurd in itself, but also downright contrary to science. *Credo quia absurdum.*

Thus far we have ascertained that Darwinism, when growing into an atheistic, or agnostic, or materialistic system of philosophy, must of necessity fail in its endeavor to "put God outdoors," as Charles Vogt once very stylishly expresses himself. Let us, however, turn our eyes away from this somewhat unpleasant and saddening picture, and take Darwinism to test in its purer and nobler form, viz., such as it presents itself to the disciple of science, strictly so called. Let us consider then Darwinism as a scientific hypothesis, as one analogous to the nebular theory of Kant, Laplace, Faye, and other astronomers, and let us see whether the theory, as thus considered, deserves the cruel and formidable charge of being atheistical and iniquitous of its very nature. This charge, if we are not quite mistaken, amounts to saying that Darwinism excludes, either explicitly or virtually, a First Cause, a Creator, a Designer, and that it does so by virtue of its intrinsic principles. Is this arraignment, however, just? Is it fair? I most emphatically answer : "No, it is neither just nor fair." As long as a First Cause, a Creator, a Designer is not excluded on principle by any hypothesis whatever, so long do we have no right to cast a slur on it and to accuse it of atheistical tendencies. Now it cannot certainly be maintained with truth that Darwinism defeats or

1 *Athenaeum*, February 20, 1892.

stands in the teeth of theism, or conversely that theism necessarily must feel hampered and uneasy on account of the supposed fetters that Darwinism is said to make use of for the sake of stifling its life.

Our final task then will consist in showing that Darwinism pure and simple, as stripped of the additional and impertinent clothes put upon it by atheism, does not contain a single element, heterogeneous to, or unharmonious with, a sincere conviction in the existence of a personal God, but that, on the contrary, theistic Darwinism answers the aims and purposes of religion as well as any other theory of evolution. Let us for the sake of clearness, draw a distinction between (1) the agencies, (2) the factors presupposed by those agencies, and (3) the evolutionary process itself.

1. The agencies of evolution, according to Darwin, are the "struggle for existence" and "natural selection," both of them supported and strengthened by certain other auxiliary agencies, such as "sexual selection;" "use and disuse of parts;" and "the law of correlative growth." I do not stop here to discuss the controversy, just now carried on between the different schools of modern Darwinism, whether natural selection alone would be sufficient to explain the origin of species, or whether a large share must be allowed also to the auxiliary agencies enumerated above. But whatever the number and importance of the agencies of evolution may be, this much is assuredly to be conceded, that they at most may be made to account only for the further development of some given primordial types of a very low order, but by no means can they afford to explain also their first origin, no matter how this origination may be conceived of in detail.

Consequently the idea of a Creator of the first life on earth remains in the Darwinian theory substantially the same as in any other theory of creation, being well supported and warranted by the whole array of proofs which are usually brought forward to establish the doctrine of creation.

If spontaneous generation ever took place in the beginning, as at present most assuredly it does not, then this can have been owing only to a special conferring of special generative powers upon matter by the Creator himself, who thus by a special act befitted lifeless matter to organize itself into true life. Thus we are landed again in the doctrine of creation, derivative creation at least, while primary or absolute creation would be confined to, or thrown back upon the very first instance in which matter and force came into being. Nor can it be admitted that this view of derivative creation is apt to

minimize the omnipotence of God, or to detract from His dignity, or to remove Him to a greater distance from His works. Quite the opposite is true. Divine omnipotence and wisdom gains rather than loses by being conceived of as one that reaches so far backwards as not only to build up organisms finished from the first, but even to bring forth the very building forces, which, under the guidance of a first impulse received in the beginning, come slowly and gradually into play, and at last result in the magnificent structure of a self-made house. In brief: the First Cause, the Creator receives at the hands of Darwinism not defeat, but greater lustre and glory, if the secondary causes are allowed to have as much share in the shaping and moulding of nature as they can afford of themselves. It is a principle of scholastic theology, distinctly laid down by Suarez, that God the All-wise, should directly create only those things which but for Him could not possibly come into being, while all other things it is more becoming should have been produced by the secondary causes. Now it is exactly the theory of organic evolution in general, and of Darwinism in particular, which acts up to this scholastic principle. Therefore, Darwinism, to say the least, may well be reconciled with the conception of a First Cause.

2. The same conclusion may be arrived at by a closer examination of the factors or conditions presupposed by the evolutionary agencies. The struggle for existence would undoubtedly lead duly to barren and negative results, and likewise natural selection would be driven to work in vain, like a hammer ever beating on unmalleable iron, if there were no certain previous conditions on which they depend. Indeed, there are two most important factors but for which all agencies of evolution would be of no avail, viz., (1) indefinite variability, and (2) the law of heredity.

Variability of organism is requisite to render those slight variations possible which in the long run are to grow out into typical divergencies. But the law of heredity, on the other hand, is calculated to accumulate and fix those variations through the successive generations, and thereby to bring forth permanent races and species. But now please look at the place where indefinite variability and heredity come to stand in the Darwinian system. Have they perhaps fallen from heaven, or how is their existence to be explained? They themselves cannot possibly be explained by natural selection, since natural selection stands in need of them as necessary conditions of its own activity. Therefore, they are evidently factors *given*, and consequently as unexplainable by the theory itself as the

chemical elements would be accounted for by the formulæ of chemistry. They are then irreducible ultimate facts, beyond which there is a blank sheet, on which every thinking mind must write the words : "A First Cause, a Designer." Indeed we here need again the First Cause to bestow on the first organisms, created by Him either directly or derivatively, that amount of variability and plasticity which would finally end in those millions of variations, along certain lines of which the specific divergencies are constantly kept running. And the same First Cause is likewise required to endow the first organisms also with those hereditary tendencies, by dint of which certain useful characters were to be retained and therein indefinitely transmitted to the offspring.

Thus we learn again how Darwinism, if looked upon in a truly scientific spirit, leads our minds forcibly to the acknowledgment of the Deity.

3. Finally, let us take into consideration the evolution process itself, and see if without a creative and designing mind it could be carried on at all. It is not generally recognized that the process of evolution, if ever it took place, has actually led to orderly and designful results. The existence of order and contrivance in nature is a fact too evident and palpable to admit of denial. Differences of opinion can arise only with regard to the efficient causes which may have brought about such admirable order, some thinkers appealing to mere chance forces or mechanical agencies, while others would more sensibly trace order ultimately to a designing Mind. If we ask our sound reason and common sense as to what view we shall take sides with, we cannot, I think, even for a moment, waver, for it is plainly impossible that the ultimate cause of order should be sought for in disorder and confusion ; the ultimate cause of design and purpose in pure chance ; the ultimate cause of contrivance in blind necessity. "If the universe," says Sir I. W. Dawson, "is causeless and a product of fortuitous variation and selection, and if there is no design or final cause apparent in it, it becomes literally the enthronement of unreason, and can have no claims to the veneration or regard of an intelligent being." But if we proceed to regard the process of evolution by "natural selection" in this new light, it becomes evident that evolution is naught else than the method by which God Himself works in, by and through nature. By no one, perhaps, has this noble and ennobling view been set forth more forcibly and defended more ably and vigorously than by Dr. McCosh in his little book : "The Religious Aspect of Evolution."

"All admit," says he, "that there is system in the production of the organic world. Those who have no faith in a power above nature, ascribe it to physical forces. Religious people, so far from denying this, should at once admit and proclaim it; and seek to find out what the forces are and the laws they follow. We cannot allow God to be separated from His works, and so we must resolutely hold that God is in the forces arranged into an order,—that is, laws which we find so interesting to observe. But this is not just the burning question of the day. There is a perplexing confusion in the statement of the question. It has been misunderstood by religious, it has been perverted by irreligious people. The former often speak of it as being whether all things are to be ascribed to God—or a portion to God, while the rest is handed over to material agency? In maintaining this latter view, they furnish an excuse or pretext to those who would ascribe the descent of plants and animals to mechanical agency. * * * * * * Now the difference between the two opposing theories thus put is misleading, and this whether put by disbelief or by belief. The supernatural power is to be recognized in the natural law. The Creator's power is executed by creative action. The design is seen in the mechanism. Chance is obliged to vanish, because we see contrivance. There is purpose when we see a beneficent end accomplished. Supernatural design produces natural selection. Special creation is included in universal creation. * * * * * The *status quæstionis* then is not between God and not God, but, between God working with and without means and by means, the means being created by God and working for Him. * * * * * * * * * There is nothing atheistic in the creed that God proceeds by instruments which we may find to be for the good of His creatures. * * * * * * In the geological development I am privileged, as it were, to enter God's workshop and see His mode of operation, and the result reached so full of provisions in bones, muscles, joints, etc."

As far as the process of evolution itself is concerned, our conclusion then runs thus: Make natural selection to become the instrumentality of God's plan and operation in nature, instead of keeping Him aloof therefrom—which latter endeavor,as we have seen above, must in any case prove a paltry failure—and Darwinism has *eo ipso* become a shining evidence in favor of theism.

It may be well to remind those who are wont to see in Darwinism nothing but infidelity and iniquity, of an analogous condition of affairs which prevailed throughout the whole of Europe at

the close of the seventeenth century. The law of universal attraction had just been discovered and made known to the public by one of the greatest minds that ever lived in England—Sir Isaac Newton. The general public stood aghast in the face of that great event, and felt it like a shock through its system. In many quarters startling fears were being entertained and grave misgivings expressed as for the disastrous effects which the new discovery was likely to produce in the minds of the masses. It seemed for a while as if a heavy blow had been dealt at the belief in God, from whom, it was alleged, an important part of His work had been taken away and surrendered to sheer mechanical agency. It was feared lest God should seem to be ousted from the universe, and driven back into a miserable corner, as His last citadel, from which fresh and renewed attacks of infidelity might sometime well succeed in turning Him out forever. Foolish people! They apparently did not even realize how in point of fact they were after all stultifying themselves. As though an engineer had to lose instead of gaining both as to the display of his abilities and for the increase of his reputation, when he fortunately succeeded not simply in framing and putting up a finished steam-engine, but also in devising and providing the very means and methods by which such an engine could automatically be raised itself into structure before our dazzled eyes. This sort of engineer, it is true, is still to be found among men. But forsooth, the Designer of universal attraction could well endure the severe shock received at the hands of Newton; for His renommée had, in point of fact, grown higher and increased in proportion to the increased perfection of His methods so admirably displayed. Newton himself, a deeply pious and religious mind, took an opportunity of drawing the general attention to this very important new circumstance. He did so in the celebrated Scholion of his "Mathematical Principles," wherein he speaks of God in terms so sublime, so convincing, and so noble, that he appears to be an Apostle of Christ rather than a Disciple of Galileo and Kepler. To allay the fears and to appease the public excitement the question had however to be treated *ex professo*, and this noble task was achieved successfully by the celebrated mathematician McLaurin, who wrote a volume in quarto to prove that the discovery of universal attraction does not at all tend to eliminate the First Cause. Those of our contemporaries who look awry on Darwinism as something intrinsically bad seem to be found in a similar mood and frame of mind. Evolution by natural selection is to the present day charged by them with

belittling the divine attributes, depriving the Deity of His sovereign power, and taking away from His grasp the supreme control over all things. However, this notion amounts to little less than a sad perversion of ideas; the First Cause, just because He is the First, cannot by any scheme or device, however cunningly contrived, be ousted or eliminated from the Universe.

> "Any rational and successful pursuit of science," says Sir I. W. Dawson, "implies the feeling of a community between the Author and Contriver and Ruler of nature, and the mind which can understand it. To science, nature must be a Kosmos, not a fortuitous chaos, and everything in the history and arrangements of the universe must be a manifestation, not only of order, but of design. * * * The true man of science must believe in a Divine creative will, in a God who manifests Himself, and is therefore, not the hypothetical God of the Agnostic; in a God who must be distinct from and above material things, therefore not the shadowy god of the pantheist, who is everywhere and yet nowhere; in a God who causes the unity and uniformity of nature, and therefore not one of the many gods of polytheism; in a God who acts on His rational creatures daily in a thousand ways by His fatherly regard for their welfare, and who reveals Himself to them; a God, in short, who made the world and all things therein, and who made man in His own image and likeness."[1]

And this same God, as these pages, I may hope, have proved to certainty, shines forth even from the very theory which by some weak-minded deceivers had been contrived to depose Him from His throne. We have clearly seen how Darwinism cannot safely take a single important step in advance, without meeting everywhere it tries to put its foot with some or other ultimate fact or condition which in its turn calls with a loud unmistakable voice for a First Cause and a Designer to account for it.

Forsooth, the Almighty and the All-wise is at the same time the Immense who pervades and penetrates all things, who fills not only space and time but even science and its hypotheses with the fulness of His presence in an almost obtrusive manner, who, in fine, proves at once really to be the beginning and the end of all things, their Alpha and their Omega.

JOS. POHLE.

1 Modern Science in Bible Lands, pp. 39-40. New York, 1889.

TOTAL ABSTINENCE.

(SECOND ARTICLE.)

IN the preceding article we have endeavored to lay down the principle on which the cause of Total Abstinence should rest, and be guided. We propose in the present paper to give some of the reasons which favor it, natural, moral and social, as well as to guard it against some dangers which lie in its way.

Leaving to others to treat this subject in a declamatory and pathetic manner, we study it as a means beneficial to many and useful to all.

From the stand-point of a view of the natural effects of the use of intoxicants, the rule is, the less of them the better. They have their use; so have opium, strychnine and aconite. The danger in the use of these latter is well known; yet duly used they are very useful. Alcoholic drinks, as we have said, have their use, and such moderate use cannot be condemned as sinful. Their nature regulates their use. But there is undoubtedly a very great danger in the unguarded and immoderate use of them, from the pleasure which accompanies such use, and which most frequently is the reason of the use of them. Of late it has become fashionable to describe the result of frequent drinking as a species of insanity, dipsomania being the term usually adopted to designate this condition. To such an extent has this gone that we see it openly advocated by those who extol the Keely cure, that this craving for alcoholic stimulants is simply a disease like any other, often inherited, and the tendency is to look on it as having been, we may say, innocently contracted; with the result of removing from drunkenness the shame which naturally should attach to it. People have been surprised to find clubs formed by those cured through the Keely process, as if they had done nothing deserving of condemnation in bringing about the need of such a cure.

Looking at the matter physiologically, it is impossible to admit such a theory. Undoubtedly there are those who have a greater appetite for stimulants than others, or a greater need. But the appetite for food and drink can be cultivated, excited or controlled. The French have a saying: c'est le premier pas qui coute; it is the first step that is the dangerous one, which costs. And it is the neglect to use prudence and moderation in the beginning that produces the so-called dipsomaniac. Constantly stimulating the nerves

of taste he brings about such a state of chronic excitement, that the slightest occasion will cause a paroxysm of craving; even the thought, when one is striving to correct himself will, by the mysterious action of the mind on the body, produce it. For some, who find themselves tending early in this direction, Total Abstinence is the only safeguard, and therefore necessary for them. This necessity becomes all the more apparent from the evil results of excessive drinking on the organs of the body, especially the liver and stomach. What the English call the "hob-nailed liver" is a terrible and incurable condition brought about by excess of alcoholic stimulants. It consists in a chronic inflammation of the membrane of the liver which dips into the organ everywhere and holds its small lobes together. The inflamed condition caused by alcohol causes it to contract, to squeeze the lobes, to interfere with their action, and the result is that what should pass through the liver, naturally, is impeded, and dropsy incurable is the result, the early stage of which is the bloated condition of the features, the later pronounced dropsy, especially of the heart, resulting in death. This of itself, it seems to us, should be enough to put one on his guard in the use of intoxicants; while it should be the reason for not a few to enter a Total Abstinence society. Certainly there is nothing more deplorable than to witness such effects, in a man whose future, but for his folly, would have been so different. How many in the very midst of a brilliant career have gone down to a drunkard's grave in this way!

Leaving this fertile field of natural causes that call for moderation, we come to the still more important one of morality. Here we are on a higher plane. St. Leo the great says: this is man's natural (moral) dignity, if he copy in himself as in a mirror the image of the divine goodness. Among the things that mar this reflection, that tarnish this mirror is excess in the use of stimulants. It clouds the mind, brutifies the appetites, and so excluding from the mind the truth and beauty which is in God, and for which it was made, drinking debases, and stimulates the lower passions, and makes of a man a mere animal, even sinking him below the level of the brute. Not only, therefore, is his natural dignity sacrificed, but he becomes a slave. He seems to have lost his birthright, liberty, so powerful is the influence to which he is subject. He will see his degradation, may loathe his boon companions, he may detest his surroundings, but in the midst of these he remains, till, becoming callous to everything, every sense of delicacy blunted, he is an object despised by

himself and despised by his associates. In this condition what moral sense is left? He is simply in a condition to be a prey to the first temptation, and the perpetrator of every enormity. The laws are lenient to a man when guilty of a misdeed in a state of intoxication, and in some cases it is well it should be so. But too often men know their evil tendencies and notwithstanding this indulge to excess, and they commit those dastardly crimes which shock the community, too often perpetrated to the destruction of those nature herself bids man care for. If to this we couple the threats of Scripture, and the words of the Apostle telling us, that drunkards shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven, the moral misery of this man is complete; there is no hope for him in time or in eternity. Yet Total Abstinence has raised such up once more, and made them conscious of their moral diginity and saved them for this world and for the next.

While such personal reasons conciliate the good will of the individual towards the cause of Total Abstinence, there are the most powerful arguments that should induce society at large to foster it, within the bounds of discretion and justice. Every man is a member of society, and has his part to fulfil. When each one does that part the others benefit by it, and the whole is perfected thereby. The neglect of duties, resulting from drinking is one of the most serious drawbacks to society. It fills the prisons, work-houses and asylums. It taxes the masses for their support. It is the cause of the greater cost imposed upon a community for the protection of its members. Besides this there is the influence of example; the associations which breed evil and crime are met with as excessive drinking increases; families are left destitute; the children grow up in neglect and in evil, to be the criminals of the future, and pauperism with its degradation goes on increasing. In self defence therefore, society must extend its protection to the cause of Total Abstinence, and it is well it does. Every indulgence and encouragement should be given it. Society will be amply repaid for whatever it may do in favor of the movement. Even if it determine to adopt measures to help on Total Abstinence and on the other hand to repress without unreasonably restricting individual liberty, what is so vitally opposed to it, it need have no fear; for besides the support of the thoughtful and prudent, it will derive benefit from such steps in better civil order, and the improved moral condition of the people. It is not our purpose to suggest means by which the State can and should further the efforts to suppress intemperance; but we can-

not refrain from referring to two measures which in our judgment should be put in practice universally. The first of these is high license, which will have the effect of diminishing the number of saloons, and in all probability of limiting the dispensing of spirituous stimulants to a more responsible class of people, whose interest it is to prevent excess in drinking. To prohibit would be neither wise nor just to the community; not wise, because it would be nugatory, and meet with the fate such measures have met with everywhere. Evasion and hypocrisy, and secret drinking on a large scale have been the result of such compulsory measures. It would be unjust to the community, because the moderate use of stimulants, as we have shown, is not wrong, but on the contrary useful, wholesome and at times necessary. To attempt to prohibit a few at the expense of the many is not wise legislation ; as we have said, those who indulge to excess in drinking are comparatively few ; and besides they will get what they want. All that can be done is to limit the traffic to prevent, as far as possible, abuse.

The second measure is the prevention of minors from frequenting saloons, and the abolishing of the "wine room" feature in the saloon. In many places the law which prevents minors frequenting saloons is in force ; whether it is well enforced is not so easy to say. The wine room is an abomination ; there is no greater occasion of evil to our young women than this. No saloon should be licensed, which would have one of these appendages, whether the saloon be great or small. It is an unfortunate thing that any woman should frequent a saloon ; but if she does, whatever is taken should be taken in public, and the protection of publicity should be assured her. This is what generally is done in the restaurants and gardens of Europe, and though we are well aware that the evilly disposed find ways of following their inclinations, it is undoubtedly the fact that publicity prevents a great deal of evil, and tends to make people stop short of excess. There is another powerful reason that prompts favouring the movement against intemperance and the fostering of the observance of Total Abstinence. The unit of society is the family ; and the condition of this initial element of society vitally affects it. The enemy of domestic happiness, of domestic virtue, of the welfare of the child, perhaps most to be feared, is intemperance. This matter need only be referred to ; all of us have seen the house of the drunkard, and the house of the sober man ; here all order, cleanliness, propriety and happiness; there disorder, squalor, indecency and misery. No other argument against intem-

perance and in favor of Total Abstinence carries greater weight with it, than the condition of the family, and we who are in the midst of the people and see the brutal ways of men towards their wives, the consequent separations, the neglect of the children, their absolute abandonment by their parents brutified by excess, would invoke any influence that could put a stop to such a state of things, and therefore it is that we are all glad to encourage those who try to gain over to the wholesome laws of sobriety or Total Abstinence any of the slaves of excess. But enactments and stringent measures are of little use unless the will be under the influence of religion, and of this influence we shall treat in our following article.

F. S. CHATARD.

CLERICAL STUDIES.

(EIGHTH ARTICLE.)

THEOLOGY.

THE GROUNDS OF CHRISTIAN BELIEF.

WE have now reached, in the course of our remarks on Clerical Studies, the stage at which they lose their general character and become special or technical.

By his previous literary and scientific training, and more still by the study of philosophy, the aspirant to the priesthood has been fitted for entering on the subjects which properly belong to his sacred calling. It is through these that we have now to follow him during the period of his initiation, and in the ensuing years in which the daily experiences of missionary work so happily combine with a continuation of his previous studies, to the unquestionable benefit of both.

These studies have for their object a distinct group of sciences, in close contact, it is true, with various departments of secular knowledge, yet separated from all by their religious character. Hence the name of Sacred Sciences which they commonly bear. They may be all considered in some sense as different departments or dependencies of the one great science of Theology. But custom has given to that name in modern times a more limited sense, as

applying only to divinely revealed truth scientifically stated and developed. It is in this restricted sense that we propose to deal with it presently. Later on we shall be led to consider the other forms of sacred knowledge which branch out from it in various directions, expanding indefinitely the field of ecclesiastical studies.

That theology, whether taken in its narrower or in its broader sense, should be the object of the unceasing mental activity of priest and cleric, is a truth so often repeated and so obvious, that we need not stop to dwell upon it here. All feel that sacred science is as much and as naturally expected in a priest as a knowledge of the law in a lawyer, or of medicine in a physician. And, just as the latter are commonly supposed to be familiar with all that concerns their respective professions, so a priest is credited with knowing everything connected with religion, for is it not written that "the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth?" In other words, the things of religion, in all their shapes, are his specialty; and as for theology proper, it is simply the staple food of his mind, the habitual dwelling place of his thoughts, to which they instinctively return, as to their natural centre, from whatever other objects may have temporarily distracted them.

But among the constituent parts of theology, there are few to which the mind of a thoughtful priest is more frequently and more forcibly recalled among us at the present day, than to its very foundation, that is, to the proofs of the Christian faith. For this reason and because of the intrinsic importance of the subject we propose to devote to it the present paper.

I.

All Christian theology rests on the fact of God having manifested Himself to mankind, not only through the spectacle of nature and the voice of conscience, but by a direct, supernatural revelation of His mind and will. If He had chosen, He might have manifested supernatural as He manifests natural truth to each individual soul; or He might have awakened in man an unhesitating response to revelation when presented from without, or He might have surrounded it with signs of its divine origin so manifest as to preclude all hesitation and dispense with all research. But such has not been the divine economy at any time. From the very beginning, heavenly truth was manifested to our first parents only in forms which might be questioned and disregarded, and ever since, whilst near

enough to man to make it accessible, it has been at all times far enough removed to allow him, if he chose, to lose sight of its existence. Even Christianity, notwithstanding the supernatural brightness with which God has surrounded it, remains to the present day for mankind at large a question freely debated and ultimately settled for each one by his own judgment.

For this reason the necessity has been felt at all times of supplying to the honest seeker after divine truth, to the believer who dwells in it, to the armed champion who undertakes its defense, unquestionable proofs on which its claims may be rested,—"of making them ready to satisfy everyone that asked them a reason of the hope that is in them." (1 Pet. iii, 15.)

Such reasons were a primary necessity when Christianity was first preached to mankind. Only on the strength of them could men be induced to submit to all that was implied in the adoption of the new faith. Later on, when the civilized world had been won to it, and during the whole period of its undisputed sway, the need was little felt, the universal acceptance of Christianity being rightly considered as the most conclusive of all proofs in its favor. But when its divine truth came to be questioned afresh and openly assailed, as it has been for the last two centuries, the necessity was once more felt to collect and to set forth the proofs, old and new, on the strength of which the Christian religion lays claim to the faith and obedience of all men.

How needful such a demonstration is at the present day, no priest need be told. For in his daily experience he cannot fail to notice that while the great majority of our Catholics retain undisturbed their ancestral faith, and see distinctly or feel deeply the indefeasible claims it has on their loyalty; still there are not a few whose religious condition shows manifest signs of weakness, whilst all distinct doctrinal belief is fast fading out of the other religious denominations. And yet among the latter, how many who feel with deep apprehension the darkness that is gradually gathering around them and silently envy the serene assurance of their Catholic friends and the strength they gather from the teachings of their priests! How many others who have become entire strangers to all belief, yet crave in secret for the light they have lost, and, like the blind man of the Gospel, stretch out to grasp some helpful hand, if perchance there be any that will lead them back to it! We may add that to none are they more ready to listen than to the Catholic priest, and thus even for their sakes—for he is a debtor to all,—

as well as with a view to strengthen, to foster and to protect the faith of those of God's children who are committed to his special care, the Catholic priest is under a strict obligation of making himself familiar with the best and most effective methods of accomplishing that blessed work.

II.

The first thing to be done in this view is to acquire a knowledge, at the same time scientific and familiar, of what is called the Evidences or proofs of the Christian faith. The student of Catholic theology has not to go far in search of them. In all the text books he finds them set forth methodically, and in substance as they have been for the last century. Originally formulated against the Deists, and built on their admission of the great natural and moral truths, these arguments have little varied in their general outlines. The mind of the inquirer is led on step by step, from a belief in God to the possibility, the necessity and the reality of a divine revelation.

This last fundamental and all important fact is established by a series of proofs drawn from the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament—the miracles of Christ and the Apostles—the character of Christ himself, and the sublimity of the Gospel;—the rapidity with which it won acceptance;—the testimony and superhuman courage of its martyrs;—the manifold benefits it has conferred on mankind.

These are what may be called the classical proofs of Christianity. But they are not the only ones. God has never ceased from the beginning to reveal to mankind His presence and His fatherly love. His action is felt all through the history of the chosen people, and more still in the history of the Catholic Church, through every phase of her existence. True, it is not equally visible everywhere and to all. But just as the practised eye of the expert or artist, in the careful examination of some great picture, detects the hand of a well-known master, not only in its main features, but in numberless minor yet characteristic touches which to the untrained remain unnoticed, so the thoughtful observer of Christianity discovers the impress of the divine hand, not only in the miracles of the Gospel and those no less great nor less unquestionable of Church history, but in countless other facts and aspects of that same Church,—in so many battles fought and won against such fearful odds, in the lives of so many of her children, in the power and holiness, which flow, as it were, visibly from her sacraments, etc.

Such proofs are less the object of formal study than of the observations and reflections of a lifetime. They grow with the mind that remains open to them; but even when they reach their full growth they cannot be imparted in their fullness to others. Only those who are gifted with a similar insight can realize and enjoy them. Hence the Christian advocate is mainly concerned with proofs more susceptible of being clearly formulated, and he studies them not only with a view to ascertain their full power, but also to accommodate them to the requirements of those to whom he expects to be helpful.

III.

This is his second duty, and in view of it he has, before aught else, to form as adequate a conception as possible of the mental condition of those to whom he appeals.

There is a wide difference in this regard between the condition of the apologist and that of the theologian. The latter is not concerned with the thoughts of those around him. He lives in the past. He grasps the forms of divine truth as they come forth under the action of philosophical principles, or show themselves through the medium of history or of biblical exegesis, or are heard through the voice of the Church. The apologist, on the contrary, whilst no stranger to the past, is principally concerned with the present, catching as they come to light the thoughts of the period, realizing the feelings, the needs, the aspirations of his contemporaries, the hidden springs of action and belief, which, consciously or unconsciously, impel them. He has to be familiar with their habits of mind and their logical methods, to follow the currents of thought which prevail in each class of society he is expected to influence. He has to learn to go down into the depths of individual souls, and discover, amid much that is wasted and decayed, what live parts still remain on which divine truth may be engrafted.

Nor must this study be confined to the time of his preparation or early ministry. For men's minds are ever moving, and it is simply wonderful what little hold certain arguments have on one generation which to the preceding generation seemed unanswerable. New facts of history, new discoveries of science come to light and alter the view of things. Statements and principles universally accepted in the past gradually make room for others, and so a new presentation of the credentials of Christianity becomes a practical necessity for each succeeding generation.

IV.

Once in possession of the data of the Christian evidences and of the mental and moral conditions to which they have to be accommodated, it only remains for the apologist to pursue in detail the work of adaptation, that is, to single out for each individual, or for each class, the proofs best suited to their needs, and to present them in the way most likely to form or to strengthen their convictions. A few remarks on each in this connection may not be amiss here.

1. To Pascal, (Pensées Art. xi.) the proof drawn from the Messianic prophecies seemed the most striking of all. Cardinal Newman (Grammar of Assent-Revealed Religion) betrays a similar feeling by the prominent position which he assigns to prophecy in his outline of the proofs of Christianity, and more still by the remarkable power with which he sets forth its testimony. Quite recently, another earnest defender of the Christian faith, the Duke of Argyle, (Nineteenth Century, 1891,) expresses himself somewhat to the same effect.

"I may be permitted here," he says, "to express a very strong opinion, that in recent years Christian writers have been far too shy and timid in defending one of the oldest and strongest outworks of Christian theology, I mean the element of true prediction in Hebrew prophecy. It may be true that in a former generation, too exclusive attention had been paid, and too much stress had been laid on details. . . . . But the reaction has been excessive and irrational."

We cannot say it has been so among Catholics, yet it must be acknowledged that the Hebrew prophecies are little thought of today, even with us, as a practical means of confounding unbelievers or of winning them to the faith. They require too much previous culture to be appreciated by any but a few. And then they are too open to discussions and difficulties of detail, too much out of harmony with the modern trend of thought to be of much avail. But they serve to strengthen the faith of the believer and to reveal to him, in the most beautiful light, the providential action of God in the preparation of man's redemption.

2. The miracles of the Gospel constitute what we might call the staple proof of Christianity. By their indestructible historical value and by their manifestly divine character, they undoubtedly form an inexpugnable fortress in which the believer may always take refuge

and dwell in security. Yet they were less appealed to in the early Christian ages because the common belief in magic and oracles lessened their demonstrative power, and even to-day they offer less help than might be expected to the inquirer and to the unbeliever. They are so far removed from the present that their very remoteness envelopes them, to the superficial observer, in a haze of uncertainty, whilst they depend for their evidence on so many particulars that the unwilling mind can easily place itself beyond the reach of their demonstrative power. Besides, the scientific and critical spirit of the day, of which we shall speak later on, has strongly turned the modern mind against all facts which imply any interference with the laws of nature ; in fact, with most of those who have ever been or who have become strangers to the faith, all miracles, even those of the Gospel, are more a hindrance than a help to belief.

3. Hence a greater readiness, in those especially whose training and mental habits are of the modern type, to listen to proofs of the moral kind. The most striking among them is found in the person and character of Christ himself, so utterly unlike that of his contemporaries, Jew, Greek or Roman,—so unlike anything in history before He came, or since He came, unless reverently copied from Him. There is something peculiarly attractive in it for the noble-minded and the pure, and it is silently winning souls to the faith day after day. It is a remarkable fact that no writer has felt more deeply or expressed more happily the transcendent human beauty of our Lord than the great Unitarian, Dr. Channing. (Character of Christ and foll. disc.)

4. A similar and, for some, no less effective charm is to be found in the Gospel itself,—in the simplicity, purity, sublimity and practical wisdom of it steachings. The Gospel is confessedly unlike any other book ; nothing approaches it in all human thought, except what is borrowed from it. No wonder that, appealing as it does, to what is noblest and worthiest in man, and revealing to him that other and higher self which each one bears within him, it should have become also, to deep and thoughtful souls, a manifest and unmistakable revelation of God.

5. The same may be said of the benefits bestowed on mankind by the Christian faith. At all times and in numberless ways, they have led men to belief. In our day, when so many consider doc-

trines less in the light of their speculative truth than in that of their power to promote human progress and human happiness, their efficacy as a proof is especially great. To the moralist, to the historian, to the student of social science, it is becoming every day more manifest that what is best in the human race since Christ came is directly traceable to His influence, and that He is, morally and socially, no less than spiritually, the Saviour of the world. This is what wins and binds many to Christianity at the present day, whilst the very thought of what the world would come to if it were to disappear from it, causes others to cling more steadfastly to the Christian faith as the only hope of the human race, and to thrust aside the difficulties which obscure its divine radiance.

It will be noticed that all these arguments rest on facts—historical, psychological, moral—which only cultured minds can verify for themselves. Yet the truth of these facts may be sufficiently ascertained without personal investigation in so far as they are formally admitted or not questioned by opponents. We may point out in particular three great facts which unbelievers can neither deny nor evade, and which they have never been able satisfactorily to account for. They are the Jewish religion, the Christ of history, and the Gospel. Nobody has ever been able to explain, short of a visible, permanent action of Providence, how the Jewish people succeeded in possessing, during so many centuries, the only rational religion known in all antiquity. Nobody could ever account on natural grounds for the apparition of such a person as Christ, even irrespective of His miracles. Nobody could ever show where such a thing as the Gospel came from, unless from God. Every attempt to do it has led only to signal failure.

The advantage of building on these facts is that they are entirely independent of the critical difficulties raised in connection with the Old and New Testament. Whatever opinion may be formed about the origin and character of either, the contrast of the Jewish religion with all other religions, of the Gospel with all other doctrines, of Christ with all other men, remains substantially the same, and equally impossible to account for.

V.

The proofs referred to thus far are purely objective, though by no means independent of the personal dispositions of those to whom they appeal. But there are others of a subjective kind, which appeal directly to the needs and anticipations of the soul, in prefer-

ence to the facts of the outside world, and it must be acknowledged that such arguments have more to do with conversions to the faith in our day than almost any others. They are based on the more deeply felt wants of human nature,—on an ever present and keen longing of the soul for guidance or for strength, or for purity and forgiveness—sometimes on a craving for direct intercourse with God or for comfort in affliction and trial.

Now only a positive, revealed religion can answer such demands, and the Christian faith, especially as it is found in the Catholic Church, meets them admirably. They see and feel this, and no more is needed to make them believers. Especially between the Gospel and God's little ones—the poor, the suffering, the oppressed, the sorrowful, there exists a divinely pre-established harmony, which makes them take to it at once and without effort. The illiterate too —that is the majority—whose very lack of culture unfits them for any personal investigation or independent judgment on the value of the ordinary proofs ; who have in fact to take the proofs themselves on trust as well as the doctrines, find in the very sense of their inability a decisive reason to accept the message as it comes to them, recommended, not only by authority, but by the very distinctness and fulness with which it answers all they need or reasonably wish to know.

But it should never be forgotten that in the matter of religious faith, as in all practical convictions, something more than mere argument is required ;—fairmindedness—a sincere wish to know the truth, and a consequent readiness to turn the eyes in the direction from which the light comes. The proofs of religion, as has been already observed, are not of a kind to compel belief. They are not, they cannot be, mathematical, or physical : they are what is called moral, that is they imply an appreciation of testimony and of the bearing of facts which it must rest with each one ultimately to make for himself. In that wonderful book, the "Grammar of Assent," Cardinal Newman has shown how intricate such appreciations are, and how dependent are proofs in all concrete matter on an endless number of premises and assumptions, acting as a rule, unconsciously and leading on the mind to its conclusions. The whole chapter on inference has a direct bearing on the present question.

In one of his earlier writings (Sermon on Reason and Faith) he had already remarked that to believe in the Gospel implies a certain condition of mind, a moral temper fitting the soul to receive, to welcome and to retain it. "The mind that believes is acted upon

by its own hopes, fears and existing opinions. This is the case with all faith and not merely religious. It is almost a proverb that persons believe what they wish to be true."

"Such," he observes on a later occasion (Serm. xii), "seems to be the state of the case when we consider it. Faith is an exercise of presumptive reasoning, or of reason proceeding on antecedent grounds; such seems the fact whatever comes of it. Let us take things as we find them: let us not attempt to distort them into what they are not. . . . If children, if the poor, if the busy can have true faith, yet cannot weigh evidence, evidence is not the sole foundation on which faith is built. If the great bulk of serious men believe, not because they have examined evidence, but because they are disposed in a certain way—because they are ordained to eternal life, this must be God's order of things. . . . Yet it does not follow that the evidence may not be of great service to persons in a certain frame of mind. Careless persons may be startled by them as they might be startled by a miracle. . . . Again religious persons sometimes get perplexed and lose their way; they are harrassed by objections; see difficulties which they cannot surmount; are a prey to subtlety of mind or over-anxiety. Under these circumstances the varied proofs of Christianity will be a stay, a refuge, an encouragement, a rallying point for faith, a gracious economy; and even in the case of the most established Christian, they are a source of gratitude and reverent admiration, and a means of confirming faith and hope."

What adds to the intricacy of the mental process in the present matter is the great number of facts it includes. Some of them, it is true, are strong enough to bear the whole weight of the demonstration, such as the resurrection of our Lord, or that of Lazarus—or the conversion of St. Paul; yet their power is largely dependent on their number. It is not any single Messianic prophecy, or any solitary miracle of our Lord, or any separate feature of His divine character, or any special trait or special benefit of His teaching that fully reveals the divine; it is the whole. And as each aspect draws its full persuasive power from the whole facts, so each fact gathers energy from its various circumstances. Details are everything in such demonstrations. Abstract proofs can be conveyed in comparatively few words. Historical or moral proofs are essentially dependent on particulars; without them they are no proofs at all, but only a a statement of proofs which might be given.

Lastly, it will be well to remember that, although most of the

arguments in support of the Christian faith are logically conclusive independently of each other, yet, as a fact, it is only in their combination that they give entire repose to the mind. If Christianity, for instance, were not a living thing amongst us, with a great history going back through centuries, the demonstration borrowed from the Gospel, whilst remaining unanswerable, would perplex more than it would convince. In the same way the past of Christianity, however wonderful, we would hardly hold with assurance as revealing the action of God, if at the very origin we did not find such a thing as Christ and the Gospel. Thus again, before we make up our minds that the latter are, one and the other, divine, we want to know what has come of them. In the sameway we fully accept miracles in support of a doctrine only when we have made sure that the doctrine is worthy of such support, and the doctrine in turn, however transcendently beautiful, we do not finally accept as coming from God, until some sign from without has given us the assurance that we may safely do so.

It is in this way that proofs, which in themselves may not seem conclusive, add nevertheless considerably to the strength of the whole argument. Thus, for instance, the harmony of the Gospel with the anticipations of the human soul already referred to, though not in itself a demonstration, opens the mind and makes it welcome the direct proof. There are many in our time who seem to need no other. Some are satisfied with less still. A distinct, earnest, statement of Christian truth recommends it so strongly to their minds that they straightway accept it. Indeed if we follow the preaching of the Gospel from the beginning to the present day, we shall find that clear statement and unhesitating affirmation, supported by the life of the preacher, have done more to implant and spread the faith all over the world than all the arguments and all the miracles which have been put forth in support of it.

VI.

It remains for us to mention the principal sources to which the advocate of Christian belief may turn for help in his work, or to which he may direct the inquirer, the weak or the tempted.

The literature of the Evidences is extremely abundant and ever growing. Much of the earlier part of it has been brought together in the nineteen quarto volumes of Migne's "Démonstrations Evangéliques." The more modern contributions are to be found by the score on the shelves of clerical libraries and in the religious and

secular periodicals of the day. Each country and each form of Christian belief has supplied arms and combatants to the common cause; Catholic France in the "Conférences" of Frayssinous, Lacordaire, Monsabré, Frémont, in the works of Aug. Nicolas, Bougaud, and scores of others. Catholic Germany is justly proud of such apologists as Guthberlet, Weiss, O. P., Hettinger, now at last being translated into English, and Schanz, the recent translation of whose work is doubtless known to many of our readers, and well deserves to be in the hands of all.

England has done her share nobly in this regard. To say nothing of the other great apologists of the last century, Butler's Analogy and the Evidences of Paley remain classical down to the present day, and are read with profit by thousands, whilst the Bampton, Boyle and other lectures supply, year after year, new discussions and proofs, many of which are destined to occupy a permanent place in the Christian Evidences. Each of the three English Cardinals of the century has contributed to the work—Wiseman in his "Relations between Science and Revealed Religion," still interesting and valuable, though written more than fifty years ago; Manning in his admirable little book "Religio Viatoris," leading on the inquirer, step by step, to a belief in God, in Christ, in the Catholic Church; Newman in many of his writings, but nowhere so completely and forcibly as in his chapter on Revealed Religion in the "Grammar of Assent." Nor has our American Cardinal been wanting to the cause. "Our Christian Heritage" meets the requirements of a vast number of honest seekers after Christian truth, and adds every day to the abundant fruits of "The Faith of Our Fathers." Brownson, Hecker, Hewit are names familiar to our readers.

Finally, among the best exponents of the grounds of Christian faith among our Protestant contemporaries we may mention Professor Fisher, of Yale (various works, summarized in Manual of Christian Evidences); Dr. Mead (Supernatural Revelation); Canon Row (Christian Evidences); Aids to Faith, etc., etc. But whilst the young theological student will find in these and so many others extremely valuable suggestions and helps, still nowhere can he meet the whole question taken up more thoroughly and satisfactorily in brief space than in most of the modern text-books of Catholic Theology.

J. HOGAN.

TWO THOUGHTS ON PREACHING.

THE importance of preaching the word of God for the instruction of the people, and, consequently, of preaching it in the most effective manner, cannot be overestimated. Volumes have been written on the subject, treating it from every theoretical and practical point of view, but not too much has been said. Little, if anything new can be added, yet old truths may be presented in a new form. The commission given by our divine Saviour to His apostles on the eve of His ascension is more than sufficient to convince the priest of God of the importance of preaching. He said to them, and through them to their successors in the ministry of the word: "All power is given to Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, teach all nations. Preach the gospel to every creature. He that hears you hears Me; and he that despises you, despises Me." And St. Paul declares that faith, without which it is impossible to please God, comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God; for it pleased God, he says, by the foolishness of our preaching to save them that believe. To perform the duties of this exalted mission in a manner pleasing to God and beneficial to the people, the preacher must, among other things, have two points deeply impressed on his mind: first, a correct idea of what is meant by preaching the gospel; and, secondly, the fact that the people stand very much in need of instruction in their religion. These points may appear elementary, but it is believed the discussion of them will prove of advantage, especially to the younger members of the reverend clergy. They shall be made the subjects of remark in this essay.

I.

What, in the correct Christian sense of the word, is meant by preaching the gospel?

There are various sources of information on this point. If we were to consult the Monday morning papers we might conclude that preaching meant lecturing on the last flood, or railroad disaster, or bank failure, or something of that sensational nature; but this would hardly satisfy those who have the salvation of souls at heart, and who believe they are divinely commissioned to labor for that end. The Christian minister must, therefore, look elsewhere; and happily he will not be doomed to disappointment. First, among the sources of information must be reckoned the very object for which our divine Redeemer instituted preaching and commanded

the teaching body in His Church to have recourse to it in the conversion of the world. It is a self-evident truth that the powers of the will cannot be influenced nor the affections of the heart moved unless the intellect is first enlightened. The diffusion of religious knowledge must, therefore, be the starting point in the conversion of both individuals and nations; and hence in order that the apostles and their successors might be successful in the prosecution of their divine mission, it was before all things necessary that they should teach the people. Christ came that man might have life and might have it more abundantly; but this is eternal life, He says, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. In the very nature of the mission of Christ upon earth is found the correct idea of what is meant by preaching the gospel.

What is founded on the nature of things must necessarily be enforced by the words of Christ and His apostles. And so it is. Having selected His apostles from among the lower ranks of the people, that by means of the weak things of the world He might confound the strong, He carefully prepared them for their sublime vocation, not only instructing them with the multitudes, but also explaining His parables and other teaching to them in private. Not content with this, He opened their minds to understand the Sacred Scriptures, and promised to send the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, to teach them all truth and bring to their minds all things whatsoever He had taught them. Not till then did they receive their commission. And what was that commission? To *teach* all nations; to teach them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them.

St. Paul insists very strongly on this view of preaching, especially in the tenth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, and in those to his favorite disciples Timothy and Titus. So, too, do the Fathers and Saints, especially Sts. Chrysostom, Augustine and Gregory, in the early Church; and Sts. Charles Borromeo, Francis of Sales, Vincent of Paul, and most of all, St. Alphonsus Liguori, in modern times. To all this must be added the models of discourses that have come down to us from our Saviour and His apostles, to which it is wholly unnecessary to add the examples of the early and later saints. The correct idea of preaching the gospel is, then, *teaching* the people the dogmatic and moral truths of religion—teaching them what they must believe and do in order to please God and attain their eternal salvation. It is, doubtless, necessary to interest and please them by language and manner; but these are means to

an end, the end is teaching. The moment the preacher loses sight of it, he loses sight also of the very object for which he has ascended the pulpit, and he had better come down.

It may be thought unnecessary to insist on this point, but I am of opinion that it can be studied to good advantage. There are two classes for whom its study may prove useful; those whose main purpose would seem to be to please their audience; and those who have to fill up the time of the Sunday sermon somehow, and generally with as little labor of preparation as possible. Happily there is not found among the Catholic clergy a third class, so numerous among the sects,—those who seize upon every sensation and make it the theme of a discourse. While the minister of the word must interest and please his hearers before he can hope to move them, it is pitiable to see the messenger of the God of heaven, who speaks in the name of Jesus Christ, devoting the greater part of his attention to rhetoric and elocution—making them ends instead of means. The discourses of his divine Model have a winning simplicity from which all this is absent; while the Apostle of the Gentiles spurns it even in the face of the fastidious Greek. Such mistaken persons should remember the advice of St. Charles Borromeo to his clergy, to imagine while preaching that they see Jesus Christ seated on a throne at the other end of the church ready to call them to account at the conclusion of the discourse for the manner in which they delivered it and the intention they had. Times indeed change, and we change in them, and the priest of God must adapt himself as far as possible to these changes in order that he may make himself all things to all men; but the end in doing so is that he may gain all to Christ, not that he may win a measure of empty applause.

Another class, as I have said, appear to be anxious to fill up the time of the sermon somehow. A favorite way is to consult a volume of sermons. There is said to be this difference between fishes and preachers; that while among the former the big ones feed on the little ones, among the latter the little ones, feed on the big ones. Many a priest on the mission in country places has to travel miles to attend distant stations or sick-calls, to minister to a widely scattered people, and has little time to prepare discourses. Such a person deserves our commiseration; and perhaps more to be pitied are assistants in the large parishes of our cities, who have little leisure, and that broken up by repeated calls from their study. But while it is lawful, and even advisable to consult sermon books occasionally, the most use

that can be safely made of them is to adopt the theme, divisions and train of thought; and fortunate is the priest who will find all these suited to the wants and circumstances of his people. But provided he keep the essential purpose of preaching before his mind, he may have recourse to this assistance at times. Still a short, simple discourse that comes from the heart is worth far more than a prize sermon that "don't fit." Witness the discourses of the Curé of Ars. The golden maxim for the preacher to fix on his mind when he ascends the pulpit is this: I am here by divine commission to *teach* these people. And this brings us to the second point, no less important: These people stand very much in need of religious instruction.

II.

From personal observation, as well as from other sources of information, I am convinced that almost every person who is so fortunate—or unfortunate—as to attract public attention, is overestimated; and it is always safe for the preacher to act on this conclusion when he ascends the pulpit. Not that his language should be incorrect, or his logic loose; but that his opinion of the people's religious knowledge should be low. Let me premise a little. The vast majority of Catholics seldom go further in religious instruction than to learn the little catechism during their attendance at Sunday school; and how few of them ever consult it after they leave that school? How extremely small the number of those who read, much less study, any one of the larger catechisms or books of religious instruction? Certainly not one in every two hundred. Now, it is well known that without reading up constantly, our knowledge will grow dim and inexact on even the most familiar subjects. The professional man is constantly reading up on whatever relates to his profession; always looking out for something new. But the Christian, after he has laid aside his little catechism—which, small as it is, he may have learned only imperfectly, and that, too, at a time when his intellect was not fully developed and was not capable of grasping its full meaning—trusts for further knowledge to the sermons he hears, and often hears with little attention. Again, there is this notable difference between the teaching of the Church and that of the sects, that, while the latter propose nothing with authority and nothing with precision, but leave their deluded victims to grope as best they may, and believe or disbelieve almost anything they please,

the teaching of the Church is precise on every essential point, and belief in those teachings is binding under pain of eternal damnation, not only as regards the outward expression of the lips, but also as regards the thoughts of the mind. However much this may be at variance with "modern thought," whatever that means, it is not only proper and necessary in a divinely appointed teacher, but it is also a source of security for those who are taught, preventing them from being tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine. Still another point that it is necessary to bear in mind is the difference between historical and doctrinal knowledge. A person may be well informed in modern history in general and in the history of the Church in particular, and yet be ignorant of the precise teachings of the Church on many points.

Next, then, to a correct idea of what preaching is, the minister of God must be thoroughly convinced that his people stand in great need of instruction in the exact teaching of the Church, for their own sake, for the sake of their families, in the case of parents, and for the sake of religion. For themselves, that they may practice their religion more intelligently, for their children, that they may instruct, or have them instructed, properly, and for religion, that they may explain its teachings and practices to the well-disposed, and defend it against the thread-bare objections that are the stock in trade of a large number of modern Solomons. There is no doubt that the cause of religion is suffering, in this country at least, from the ignorance of Catholics, and this is true not only of the rank and file, but it is equally true, and more strikingly apparent in those who pass for learned, and who are learned in all else but the one thing necessary. How few of our learned Catholics are able to answer a dozen ordinary questions in the catechism with precision. I have heard more than a hundred thousand confessions, and it is very common to meet with persons who, though they have been confessing for thirty or forty years, are unable to say the act of Contrition correctly. The best instructed Catholics I have ever met are certain farmers or tradesmen who take "the Poor Man's Catechism," or some such work, and master it; but it is as a rule useless to expect religious knowledge among those who pass for learned. When are they seen to consult a religious work? When are such books seen in their library? Some may occasionally want to know why the Church is so far behind the age; but this only betrays their ignorance. After more than twenty years of experience in city, town and country, and after preaching more

than five thousand times, I am thoroughly convinced of what I say. The preacher, then, it must be repeated, should start out with the well-grounded conviction that his people are to a great extent ignorant of the precise teachings of their religion, and that he is there by divine commission to instruct them. This conviction will guide him in the selection of his themes, his train of thought, his arguments and his illustrations. The people, as a rule, like copious illustration and simple language. It is a mistake to suppose that educated people dislike simple language, and it is a greater mistake for the preacher to imagine that it is unworthy of the pulpit. No one knew better than our divine Lord what style was best suited for the people, and yet of all the sermons that have come down to us, His are the simplest. And the sermons of St. Peter, that converted thousands, are utterly devoid of oratorical display. Although what are called set sermons are sometimes necessary, they are not the sermons that bear most fruit; in other words, the more glory the preacher gets, the less accrues to God. There is a vast amount of admiration expressed for sermons by people who do not understand them; like the Scotch woman who praised the minister's sermon, but when he asked her if she understood it, she replied, "How could I hae the presumption?"

It must be admitted that priests, more perhaps than any other class of persons, have a tendency to use big words, and that, too, for reasons that are no fault of theirs. In the study of their philosophy and theology they are constantly meeting with Latin and Greek words from which others in English are derived; and what more natural than to adopt these derivatives in speaking or writing the vernacular? And there are few books put in their hands in this part of their studies that place them face to face with the good old Anglo-Saxon. On the contrary, most of the books in English which they are naturally lead to consult during this part of their course are composed by professors who have been trained under similar circumstances, and whose writings abound in Latin and Greek derivatives of "learned length and thundering sound."

I shall here venture a further remark, which, I trust, will not be taken amiss; it is, that sufficient attention is not paid to the study of the English language in some of our ecclesiastical seminaries. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, owing to the brief history and rapid growth of the Church in this country not a few of the professors in our seminaries are not from English speaking countries; and, having spent the greater part of their lives as pro-

fessors, they deal principally in the Latin, and have not a practical knowledge of the importance of the vernacular. Hence they sometimes fail to give it the place it deserves. I am stating facts of which I am thoroughly convinced; but I do not wish to censure anyone.

In the second place, a large number of our students are poor, and the seminaries where they study are poor, and for these reasons they have to be hurried through their course as fast as possible. The Latin language is made the measure of their course, because it is the medium through which they must learn philosophy and theology. They know this, and consequently devote their principal attention to it, giving the English the second place. I speak from a painful personal experience. Many is the day I rose at three in the morning to study so as by any possibility to get through. Yet whatever the priest learns is not for himself but for his people, and it must be imparted to them in their language. Now, language is a medium for the communication of thought; but a medium is of little use unless it is transparent. The primary object of the preacher is not only to speak that he may be understood, but so that he cannot be misunderstood.

Another error against which the preacher should guard himself is that of supposing that this is an age of thought. Nothing could be wider of the mark. There never was a time in the history of the world when there were so few solid thinkers as compared to the number of those who are able to read. The daily newspaper is the cyclopedia from which most persons derive their information; and it is little more than a news-gatherer with various shades of development of the moral—or perhaps the immoral—sense. And the editorials, as a rule, evince very little serious thought. The people think little on serious subjects, and least of all on religious subjects. The preacher must think for them.

In addition to zeal and love for souls, four things, among others, are necessary for the preacher of the gospel. In the first place, he should have a perfect command of his native language; for however profound and varied his knowledge may be, it is by means of his language that he must communicate that knowledge to others; and no one can communicate to others all that he knows himself on any subject, nor with the same precision with which he apprends it.

In the second place, he should be familiar with the sacred Scriptures; for they are an inexhaustible source of knowledge; and quoted verbatim, they carry with them a weight that no other

written language possesses. Some of the homilies of the Fathers, especially of St. Bernard, are little less than a catena of Scripture texts; and among American prelates, this is more true of the pastorals of the late Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore than perhaps of any other.

It is needless to add, in the third place, that the preacher of the gospel should be familiar with his theology. This is the one grand authority from which he must derive the teaching of his people both in faith and morals, and that alone is sufficient to show its paramount importance. But prudence is the queen of the moral virtues, and hence the preacher must know the circumstances and wants of his people in order that his teaching may always be in place, and that he may not be as one beating the air.

I trust that however strong the language may have been in some parts of this article, it will be felt that I have spoken from conviction, and have had nothing further from my mind than to wound the sensibilities of anyone, much less a brother priest.

A. A. LAMBING.

SACERDOTAL CONFRATERNITIES.

(THE APOSTOLIC UNION OF SECULAR PRIESTS.)

THAT one among the marks of the Church of Christ, which has preponderating influence in winning souls to a knowledge and love of her, is sanctity. Whilst the striking characteristic of her unity throughout the world and all ages elicits the thoughtful attention of serious minds, and convinces by that subtle force born of the truth as displayed in the consistency of her doctrine, it is nevertheless the note of holiness which wins to her bosom the far greater number of those with whom the first step in the process of logical reasoning toward doctrinal truth is the practical demonstration of virtue as its result.

It is but natural that men should look for this evidence of holiness as a proof of the teaching of revealed truth in the lives of those who profess to hold the leading position of teachers in the Church of Christ. Accordingly the clergy and the religious orders are the direct exponents of that perfection which the Catholic religion aims at inculcating. To them it belongs to draw into the fold of Christ those who are willing to receive the light, which, we are told, was

not to be hidden under a bushel, but to be placed within sight of all men. Whilst the religious communities are in an especial way the nurseries of virtue and Christian perfection, it is nevertheless true that in the ordinary economy of God's Church they hold a subordinate place to the secular clergy. They may be considered, to use the words of Leo XIII, "perinde esse atque auxiliares copias," helpers in the great work of conversion and sanctification, to which the priesthood, as a whole, is called. The secular clergy, under the leadership of their Bishops, are the regular officers, so to speak, in the army of the Lord. The rank and file of Christ's soldiers and of the world's children look to them for the first impulse of every heavenward movement. Hence Christian holiness is incumbent first and foremost upon the priest.

> Componitur orbis
> Regis ad exemplum ; nec sic inflectere sensus
> Humanos edicta valent, quam vita regentis.

Even knowledge, so essential in our day to the secular clergy, is secondary in importance to piety.

To the religious the means for the promotion of both piety and knowledge is ever at hand. His store of learning can be increased by frequent contact with the bright minds of his order and by the facilities which community life offers in other respects. His piety is fostered by the constant exercises prescribed in his rule. There is nothing to interfere with this ; little to draw him from his spiritual duties, whilst on every side example, counsel and persuasion urge him onward in the way of perfection. Thus even leaving aside his vow of obedience, the community life in itself has untold advantages for his sanctification of self and consequently the imparting of God's kingdom of grace to others.

The position of the secular priest places these advantages as a rule beyond his reach. Except in the larger cities he has generally to live alone and oft-times at a distance from other priests ; his varying duties and occupations make the keeping of a strict rule almost an impossibility ; his manifold cares extending to every spiritual and often temporal interest of his flock, so engage his faculties that insensibly the ardor of his spiritual zeal is weakened. His sacred calling does not altogether place him beyond those worldly influences which play upon the weakness of human nature and which prove a reason for the breaking down of those fervently made resolutions to persevere in the perfection of his state which filled the young priest's heart on the first day of his priesthood.

At his ordination there was placed upon him the obligation of increasing in knowledge and piety. "Ut in lege Dei *die ac nocte meditantes*, quod legerint, credant; quod crediderint doceant, et quod docuerint imitentur, etc." True and practical piety in the priest naturally leads to the cultivation of knowledge. Every one of his sacred duties requires a certain preparation which of itself fosters study and useful reading. Hence he must lay particular stress in his daily life on preserving and fostering the spirit of piety.

Zeal is not enough to keep our charity enflamed, for its tendency is gradually to become selfish, to seek human praise instead of disinterested glory of God. The frequent and regular use of the Sacrament of Penance is no doubt a great help to perseverance. The annual retreats of the clergy rouse new lights and awaken fresh resolutions. In many cases the natural disposition, inherited habits of life, keep a priest in the right course despite many distractions and temptations. But for the great majority still other means are required to aid them to constant perseverance in their sacerdotal lives. The counsel and the example of a brother priest, the binding force of some compact made and often recalled, is perhaps the most efficient way to keep the soul of the priest from those weaknesses and contaminations which destroy the virtue of his ministry by robbing him of the character of sanctity.

Our confraternities, leagues and sodalities have for an object the strengthening of the bonds of piety among the faithful, and it is wonderful to see the impetus that is thereby given to the Christian lives of those who observe with fidelity the popular devotional exercises which are part of these pious unions. On every side, persons who have previously led an ordinary life, become zealous workers for the glory of God. Would not a similar association of priests effect a like good and promote to a greater extent the apostolic spirit, even among the faithful?

> "For men, by His example, pattern out
> Their imitations and their regard of laws."

The utility of a confraternity for priests as a decided means to promote the spirit of piety among the secular clergy can hardly be questioned.

There are, within our knowledge, two organizations of secular priests in this country; they are the Eucharistic Union and the Apostolic Union of Secular Priests.

The Eucharistic Union has a large membership in Europe and has during recent years gained a large access in this country. Its

one object is to diffuse among its members a more earnest and intense devotion toward the Blessed Sacrament, and its one duty is to spend one continuous hour of adoration every week before the tabernacle. At the beginning of the month each member receives a notice recalling the day and hour of adoration, and also giving the subject of meditation and prayer which should occupy him during that time. Before the end of the month he returns to the Superior this notice signed in token of fulfillment. The return of the notice is deemed a matter of great importance for preserving the practical spirit of the Union, and as an evidence of the earnestness of its members.

This Union is connected with, and dependent upon, the Society of the Blessed Sacrament, a congregation founded some years ago by Rev. Fr. Eynrard in France. The priests, who compose this community, have continual exposition of the Blessed Sacrament with services at stated times each day. They accept no other charge but that of extending directly the devotion of the Blessed Eucharist, and they are obliged to make this the exclusive subject of their preaching. They have one house in Canada, but the Eucharistic Union in the United States is in charge of the Rt. Rev. Abbot of St. Meinrad's Abbey in Indiana.

The Apostolic Union has a wider sphere than the Eucharistic Union, since it embraces the full spiritual life of the priest, and aims to bring all secular priests under a rule proportioned and suitable to their needs and occupation.

It consists, according to its constitution, "in the reunion of secular priests, who observe the same rule, under the direction of a Superior whom they choose among themselves." It is, therefore, entirely independent of any religious order. "Its object is to offer to secular priests, in the discharge of their holy ministry, a great part of the aids and means to perfection which the community life affords to the regular clergy; to strengthen priests against the dangers of laxity that often follows their isolated position; to procure for devout priests a valuable aid to live according to their highest ideals, and, finally, to give them a rule by which they may live more cordially in unity of mind and sentiment with their brethren."

The features of the Union are: a general rule which embraces the principal duties of a priest's life; a Superior to whom an account of the observance of the rule is given monthly, and, finally, reunions which are held at stated times.

The rule requires the setting apart, monthly, a day of recollection, and the celebration of a Votive Mass in honor of the Sacred Heart to which the Union is especially dedicated. A record is kept of the observances of the daily life of a priest according to a schedule with spaces allotted for every day of the month. These items are specified: to rise one hour before Mass, meditation of twenty minutes, memento at Mass for the Union, preparation and thanksgiving, ecclesiastical study, spiritual reading a quarter hour, visit to the Blessed Sacrament, anticipation of Matin and Lauds, the reading of a chapter of the S. Scriptures, particular examen, rosary, note of Mass intentions received and fulfilled, preparation of meditation for the next day.

From the above schedule, it is evident that what is asked of the members is no more than what is practically observed by a large number of the clergy on their own account; nor is it anything beyond what every priest resolves to do when he enters on the sacred ministry. As a matter of fact the performance of one of these obligations leads quite naturally to that of the others.

The Bulletin fixes no hour for the performance of any of the duties specified. They neither bind under sin nor is any penalty attached to their non-fulfillment.

There can be, however, no doubt but that the gentle pressure which the daily recording of our fulfillment or omission of each of these duties exercises, will have a powerful effect in keeping the members faithful to their performance.

The filling out of the daily schedule and an account of it given at the end of the month fosters habitual examination of conscience and is of great importance in insuring perseverance and regularity in the performance of sacerdotal duties, for it is impossible not to see after a time from the schedule which is marked each night that certain duties are too frequently or habitually omitted, and our good will awakens us to the need of more attention. This with the monthly report to the Superior will bring to notice what might otherwise remain entirely neglected. Regularity is the strength of the soul, and the above method is an effective means of producing it.

No doubt, thousands of priests live up to all these requirements though they have never heard of the Apostolic Union and who have no need of its aid in order to persevere. Still, as was said above, not all are of that disposition. Besides, union in a matter like this is apt to draw by example, and others may be won to observe the same rule who would find in it a safeguard for their way of life "ut

abundet in eis totius forma virtutis." But we need not dwell any further upon these advantages. "Qui regulae vivit," says St. Bernard, "Deo vivit." Moreover, it must be remembered that the members of this Union participate by a special privilege in the prayers and penances of the Franciscans, Theatines, Carmelites, Dominicans and Trappists.

The Union has no temporal or material end to advance if we except the council given to all its members according to which they are to foster ecclesiastical vocations in their midst.

The Union is of our time and is especially suited to the needs of the secular clergy having no direct affiliation with any of the religious orders. It is not thirty years since it was established in France by the Rev. M. Lebeurier who is still its Superior General. His intention was at first to establish communities of priests who live under this rule much the same as was done in Germany two hundred years since by the Ven. Bartholomew Holzhauser. But this object was modified so as to effect the present Rule for the Union which simply requires that the members shall observe the prescribed points as far as possible.

The Union has received the approbation of Pope Pius IX and Leo XIII, in several briefs. In his letter under date May 31, 1880, after showing the beauty and advantage of the Apostolic Union our glorious Pontiff Leo XIII thus concludes: "Si Decessores Nostri amplissimis commendarunt laudibus utilissimum hoc institutum; id ultro libenterque et Nos facimus, potissimum in tanta temporum difficultate quae *illius opem plane postulare* videtur; imo *quotquot sunt seculares sacerdotes hortamur, ut sibi ipsis reique religiosae efficacius prospecturi, saluberrimae isti Consociationi dent nomen.* Moveat eos haud obscurum divinae Providentiae placitum quae nunc denuo suscitavit hoc Institutum in Ecclesiae suae laborantis subsidium. Moveant coelestes benedictiones, quibus inter gravissimas difficultates brevi hujus operis incrementa mirabiliter provecta fuerant. Moveant Episcoporum plausus constantes Apostolicae hujus Sedis laudes, fructus jam parti; quos semper uberiores propagatio ipsa Consociationis merito spondet. Hos Nos amplissimos ipsi ominamur in Cleri sanctificationem religionisque nostrae sanctissimae gloriam; dum superni favoris auspicem et paternae Nostrae benevolentiae pignus, Apostolicam Benedictionem toti Consociationi et iis omnibus qui eidem daturi sunt nomen peramanter impertimus."

These strong words have given an impulse to the formation of Unions throughout Christendom and there are at the present time over 5,000 members in various parts of Europe and America.

The Union has been in existence for some years in the United States, and it has made its way quietly into the knowledge and favor of priests. At present its field of influence is sufficiently far extended to prevent it from being looked upon as an "innovation," and we do not think it inopportune to have its advantages placed before the view of all. Unions have been established in Boston, Rochester, New York, Davenport, and San Francisco, to which priests from other dioceses are attached.

The organization is completely subject to the Bishop of the respective diocese where it may be established, so that modifications can be made in the various centres according as it is deemed needful. Diocesan unions may be formed, provided there are at least six members in a diocese or province.

It is one of the fundamental principles of the Union that its members shall in no way or manner singularize themselves or act as if they were a class apart.[1]

Besides these two unions, which may be canonically termed confraternities since they have been approved as such by the Holy See, there are other associations of priests which are established on the basis of benevolence. Many of them have religious obligations attached, but they can hardly be regarded as in the same light as the Apostolic Union and as constant monitors of the duty of advancing in sacerdotal perfection.

The two unions which we have mentioned may, in a measure, be regarded as two degrees of the same confraternity, although they have no avowed connection one with another, either in their rule or government.

Many will feel the obligation of an hour's adoration before the Blessed Sacrament once a week to be a sufficient reminder of their high purpose as priests. Others will seek the advantage of being daily reminded of their duties. This will be done by the Bulletin of the Apostolic Union, which acts as a silent monitor, recalling attention to duty when nature would make it flag.

Both associations are but gracious means placed before the clergy to aid in bringing out the sanctity of the Church, and to urge us onward to the great work of conversion which awaits the application of our energies in this prosperous land.

D. J. McMAHON.

1 Further information may be obtained by applying to the Rev. D. J. McMahon, of the New York Union, or the Rev. B. A. Schulte, Templeton, Iowa; or the Rev. J. H. Day, Dansville, N. Y.

CONFERENCES.

RULE OF LIFE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE APOSTOLIC UNION.*

I. Rules and principles relating to their private life;—II. Rules and principles relating to the various ministries in which the members of the Union may be employed.

ARTICLE THE FIRST.

Rules and principles relating to their private life.

I. General principle;—II. On what must be done each day;—III. each week;—IV. each month;—V. each year;—VI. On various points.

I.

General Principle.

53. The members of the Union should so arrange their daily life, as to make it resemble as far as they can the life of the incarnate Word on earth. Like that of the Saviour Himself, it should be a *laborious life*. The following are the principal points to be observed in order to gain this end:

II.

Each Day.

54. The members of the Union shall have a fixed hour for *rising*, after seven hours of sleep, unless weak health demand more. Their first act shall be to offer the day to the divine Heart of Jesus, uniting their intentions with His, and renewing their purpose of combating their predominant failing. While dressing they shall entertain pious thoughts, which should be in keeping with the subject of their *prayer*.

55. This *prayer* should be made as soon as possible and should last about half an hour. It shall generally consist in meditating on

* This Rule, which may be modified accordingly as local circumstances require it, is here given in order to throw more definite light upon the subject of *The Apostolic Union* treated in this number by the Rev. D. J. McMahon, D. D.

some of Our Lord's words or in contemplating one of His mysteries. However there is no reason why each one should not follow any of the methods taught by masters of the spiritual life, following the different states of the soul; or employ the time assigned in laying his needs before Our Lord in consulting Him as to how he is to act in difficulties, in recommending souls to Him for whose salvation he is striving. The Priest is the steward of Jesus Christ; he cannot do too much to become embued with the thoughts and desires of his Master.

56. But it is at the *Holy Mass* that the union of the priest's heart with the Heart of Jesus is daily consummated and drawn closer. And hence this great action shall be to the associates the pivot of their entire existence. They shall prepare for it during a few minutes, if it should not follow another exercise of piety; they shall celebrate with deep recollection, pronouncing the words distinctly, and performing the ceremonies so as to edify those that are present. That they may be neither too fast nor too slow, they shall remain at the altar little more nor little less than half an hour.

57. They shall be very careful to employ well the precious moments which follow the Holy Mass, and during which they have the happiness of possessing Jesus really present in their hearts. Then especially shall they be penetrated with the sentiments of our sweet Saviour, and they shall beg Him to destroy whatever in them is displeasing to Him. Then especially shall they make more strenuous efforts to transform themselves into Him, and, as it were, do Him violence by the fervor with which they shall recommend their own spiritual interests, those of the souls confided to their charge and the great interests of His Church.

58. They shall recite the *divine Office* with all care. They shall put aside as much as possible all distracting causes. They shall not forget that, according to the doctrine of St. Augustine, it is Jesus Christ who prays in the Psalms; and while reciting them they shall unite their prayers to His prayers and their sentiments to His sentiments. All shall acquire the habit of saying, on the eve, the Matines and Laudes of the morrow. They shall pray in a very especial manner for the wants of the Church and of the Sovereign Pontiff, for their Bishop and the diocese to which they belong.

59. They shall *read the Bible* every day during about half an hour; and that they may understand its different meanings, they shall call in the aid of an authorized commentator.

60. They shall give to the *study of theology* a period of time

more or less long, according as the occupations of their ministry will leave them more or less leisure. This study may extend successively to the different parts of theology, including ecclesiastical history. But there is one part which must be constantly studied, because the priest must daily use it: *moral theology*. Nothing can be more useful than to set aside each day a fixed time, which should be employed rather in forming the judgment than in recalling to mind the doctrine of authors.

61. They will read for some time each day *some pious book, or the life of a saint.* The living portraits of Jesus Christ, the saints, teach us to imitate Him in our turn ; and their example instructs us better than others' books.

62. In houses where there are several members of the Union the Holy Scriptures shall be read at the beginning of dinner, and at the commencement of supper the Imitation of Christ. The Superior, or, if he is not present, the eldest shall bless the table. During the repast, if no reading is going on, only things edifying shall be spoken of, and care shall be taken that nothing may be said which the waiters may not hear.

63. After each repast they may *recreate* for an hour, and this hour is to be looked upon as very usefully employed, if it shall have drawn into a closer union the hearts of the members. The time after meals, as being less adapted to study, might be chosen for visiting the sick or the parishoners. In the course of the afternoon they shall make a visit to the Blessed Sacrament. "I have a burning thirst," said our Lord to B. Margaret Mary, "to be loved by men in the most Blessed Sacrament, and I find scarcely one who offers himself, according to my desires, to allay it in making me some return."

64. The *rosary*, if well recited, will greatly contribute to raise the fervor of the soul when the occupation and distractions of the day may have diminished it. The priests of the Union will not be satisfied with making this exercise a prayer, in every sense of the word, in meditating piously on the mysteries; they will moreover make it a prayer, entirely apostolic, by saying each decade, as Halshauser advises, for a particular class of needs.

65. The associates, following the advice of St. Francis de Sales, shall not sit up late. They shall *go to bed* not later than ten o'clock. Before retiring for the night, during a quarter of an hour they shall prepare the meditation of the morrow, and shall make an examen of the day passed.

66. They shall, at the same time, make a *particular examen* of their predominant fault, with the greatest care, and they shall impose some slight penance for each relapse. This exercise, whence depends a great part of their advancement in virtue, would bear greater fruit were it made a first time towards the middle of the day.

67. As, generally, the associates have not the advantage of living under the eye of the Superior, they should note, every evening, on a bulletin prepared *ad hoc*, their exterior violations, if any, of the Rules.

III.

Each Week.

68. The members of the Union should *go to confession* every week, or at the latest every fifteen days. They shall not hesitate to go oftener and to forestall the day appointed, in order to bring to the altar a conscience perfectly pure. Not only shall they listen with docility to the advice of their confessors, but they shall ask them to be kind enough to point out the faults into which they fall without perceiving it.

IV.

Each Month.

69. Each month they shall make a *recollection*, which will help them to correct the faults into which their carelessness may have led them, and excite anew their fervor. Their meditation, which shall be prepared with the greatest care, shall be directed to a subject proper to produce this renewing of the spirit; they shall ask this for each other of God at the *memento* of the Mass. In the course of the day they shall spend at least half an hour in a serious examen of their conduct during the month. They shall run over the different points of the Rule, and note their omissions in order to render a strict account either *viva voce* or in writing to the Superior, that they may receive suitable advice from him. To this review of the month they shall join the exercise of the preparation for death. That this little retreat may be made with greater recollection, they shall not, that day, if possible, receive or pay visits.

70. Every month, on one of the first days, the bulletin on which have been noted, each day, their exterior defects against the

Rule, is sent to the Superior, who will thereby know the conduct of each and will be placed in a condition to give, in returning the bulletin, useful admonitions and advice. This practice, annoying to nature, is of undoubted efficacy to have the Rule faithfully observed, it is a daily control which supplies in part the advantages of a community life. Hence, all the associates should be much attached to this practice and regard it as altogether essential.

V.

Each Year.

71. Whenever not obliged to take part in the annual *retreat* of the diocese, the members of the Union shall, every year, make, during eight days, the holy exercises. It would be very much to their advantage could they come, several together, to make them under the direction of a priest capable of rousing them to a stricter fulfilment of the rules of their pious Society.

72. The associates are very earnestly recommended to visit each other, as often as circumstances will permit, to speak of things of God, of their ministry, and of whatever may help to a more perfect attainment of the object of their pious association. Thus, it would be good if several, even two, should meet together to make the monthly retreat, to hold a spiritual conference, or to treat of some point of ecclesiastical discipline.

VI.

Rules on Different Points.

73. The works of the parochial ministry are varied enough to afford relief from weariness, and to prevent the loss of time which any other rest implies. The recreations themselves should be spent in useful and agreeable conversations with their *confrères*, or in some manual labor which may give repose to the mind without exposing to idleness.

74. If there are useless recreations, there are *readings* which are no less a loss of time. The associates shall keep themselves on their guard against the flood of newspapers and of empty pamphlets, from which there is nothing, or next to nothing, to be learned. They shall take equal care not to allow themselves to be absorbed in studies more serious perhaps, but foreign to their ministry. From the moment when these studies take up too much of their time or fetter their liberty of mind, they would be hurtful, since

the time and activity of a priest belongs to Jesus Christ and to souls.

75. The members of the Union could not do better than to leave aside entirely *card-playing*. If however they should sometimes comply with the wishes of their *confrères* in this matter, let them be very firm in not allowing themselves to be drawn into an inexcusable loss of time. A means very apt to remove excesses in these kinds of games, would be to set aside the gains to relieve the poor.

76. They shall not undertake any *journey* that has only curiosity for its object; and whenever they think they have other motives let them seriously examine whether the gravity of these motives counterbalances the losses, of more than one kind, which such journeys cause. In any case, they cannot do better than consult the Superiors of the Association, and follow their advice.

77. The members of the Union shall pay very few visits simply for politeness' sake. They shall avoid, as much as possible, being alone with persons of the opposite sex. Let them receive such persons in the parlor and make the visits as short as possible.

78. They shall be moderate and reserved in their *correspondence*, whether as to the number of their letters, or their length, or the manner of writing. Let their letters never be such as to compromise their sacred calling if, as there is always room to fear, they should fall into the hands of strangers.

ARTICLE II.

Rules and Principles Relating to the Different Ministries in which the Members of the Union can be Employed.

I. Nature of such ministries;—II. On preaching;—III. On catechetical instruction;—IV. On the sacrament of penance;—V. Visits to the sick, to the poor, to the afflicted;—VI. On pious associations and confraternities among the faithful;—VII. On retreats and missions;—VIII. On great catholic works;—IX. Particular admonitions to pastors and assistants.

I.

Nature of Such Ministries.

79. The members of the Union who exercise the same functions as other priests shall apply themselves to giving assurance of success, by the mutual aid which they shall lend to each other for the

fulfillment of these functions, and by the care they shall take to act from supernatural motives.

II.

On Preaching.

80. Their *Sermons* will show forth this spirit, if all their instructions lead up to the Incarnate Word, if, above all, they make it a point to bring out His infinite amiability, in recalling with affection His words and example. By this means, they will avoid the fault of making of the word of God a dry and cold abstraction, as incapable of fortifying the will as of profoundly moving the heart. On the contrary, the religion which they preach shall be a living religion, loving and loveable, as condescending as it is perfect, it shall be, in one word, the religion of the Heart of Jesus.

81. Their preaching must not be, however, merely affective; they shall set themselves on the contrary and above all to *instruct* their hearers. They must not divorce moral from dogmatic instruction, nor must their pious exhortations lack the clearness of exact and solid doctrine.

III.

On Catechetical Instructions.

82. Of all the various kinds of instruction, that to which the associates shall bend with greatest energy, after the example of their divine Master, is the instruction of children and the ignorant. To teach the catechism shall be for them the most pleasing of all their pastoral functions; they shall omit no effort to acquit themselves of it well, and they shall love it so that they will have no difficulty in communicating this love as well to the young as to those advanced in years, to whom the catechism is not less necessary than to children. As far as possible, they shall divide the children whom they are to instruct into three classes: the first class shall be composed of children of six years old and upwards who are to be prepared to make their first confession; the second, of the children who are, in a year or two, to make their first communion; the third, of those who have already made their first communion and to whom a complete knowledge of their religion will be of great advantage. They shall adapt their teaching to the capacity of each of these classes; but they shall have no preferences for one above the others. Like St. Paul, they shall make themselves like a mother who suckles her children while they are capable

of no stronger food. They shall be young with the young, using language at once simple and full of illustration and examples. They shall make the application of their doctrine by stories borrowed especially from Holy Scripture and the lives of the Saints In order to stimulate the attention of their young audience and to suppress levity, they shall make use of encouragements rather than of reprimands, and of the excitements of recompenses more than the fear of punishments ; and when they shall have come to make the young generation know, and, above all, love dearly the christian doctrine, they will thank God for a very important triumph.

IV.

The Sacrament of Penance.

83. The confessional is another sphere wherein the priest is called upon to show all the charity of Jesus Christ. There he shall learn of his Master the divine art of encouraging the sinner without encouraging sin. He will have understood his model but very imperfectly if the most tender kindness be not the prominent feature of his conduct with regard to sinners. Of course he will not give absolution to one who is badly disposed—for it would be hurtful to him—but he will do all that zeal can do to bring this poor soul to the proper dispositions ; and even when he will believe it his duty to put off absolution for a while, he shall know how to make him accept this delay without a murmur. Far from yielding to the baleful prejudice which, in certain countries, would formerly refuse absolution to young children, they shall make them approach very early in life the tribunal of confession; they shall assign particular days on which they may prepare them more at leisure, and they shall not hesitate to give them absolution after this due preparation, when they shall know them to be capable of sinning.

84. The priest in the confessional is not only a confessor, he is a *director*, too, and union with the Heart of Jesus is very useful for the proper discharge of this duty also. For the mission of the director is none other than that of forming Jesus Christ in the soul, of reproducing in the faithful, under one aspect or other, the sanctity of His Sacred Heart. To know Our Lord is, then, absolutely necessary that he may discharge this mission well, for he must take into account Christ's designs on each soul. By this only can he discern what must be subtracted or added, or know how to combat her defects and how to lift her up to the acquisition of the solid virtues.

V.

The Sick, the Poor, the Afflicted.

85. The priests of the Union, following the example of their divine model, shall extend a more tender and more devoted charity to the suffering members of Jesus Christ, to the sick, the poor and afflicted. They shall never repel them, no matter how unfortunate they be ; they shall be always ready to start when called to visit the sick : they shall pay them frequent visits, and shall find in their own charity the art of alleviating their pains. They shall look upon the trials which come upon their parishioners as messengers of divine mercy, and hasten with the consolation of faith and charity to the houses whose doors have been opened by these divine messengers.

VI.

Pious Associations and Confraternities Among the Faithful.

86. These works will afford to the zeal of the priest very precious resources ; for they will offer occasions of adapting his teaching to the special needs of each of the particular categories of the flock ; they will give him in the persons who are at the head of the different congregations, auxiliaries whose action will often obtain without difficulty results which he could of himself scarcely hope for. The great secret of apostolic men is to multiply their action and to cause others to act in acting themselves.

87. *Men* shall be an object of especial care to the members of the Union. With this object in view they shall establish congregations or societies (St. Francis Xavier, Holy Family, &c.), composed of married and unmarried men. To hold the meetings with perfect exactitude, to observe punctually the rules, to give short and familiar instructions, to be content with directing, and to leave the largest part to the spontaneity and liberty of the dignitaries and to the council, such are the principal conditions of success.

88. When possible they shall have a mass on Sundays for men only, at an hour the most convenient for them, at which they shal give a short instruction of ten minutes length, or of a quarter of an hour at most. They shall assign them commodious places, from which they may easily see the ceremonies, and hear the sermon and they shall try to speak so as to be interesting to them. If choirs of young men can be formed, they shall not fail to do so, even should they be compelled to give rehearsals during the week.

89. They shall adopt similar means that the *congregations* of the children of Mary may flourish; the associations of christian mothers, or of St. Ann, for married ladies, of St. Blondine for servant girls, &c.

VII.

Retreats and Missions.

90. However useful and abiding is the influence of these means of salvation which we have just indicated, they cannot prevent a certain number of souls from dropping into a fatal torpor, unless some extraordinary means are occasionally taken to rouse them. *Missions, retreats of sodalities, of first communicants, the Forty Hours*, are very favorable occasions to obtain the happy results especially where it is possible to have missionaries. Unfortunately, such is not always the case. The zeal of the priests of the Union will supply this valuable service, with almost the same success and with much less expense. They shall be, therefore, always ready, as far as the necessities of their own parishes will permit, to go to the aid of their brethren, only demanding in return the same service. The Union of priests, as it grows in numbers, will also render more easy their mutual assistance. And not only will the parishioners be more frequently evangelized, but the priests themselves will escape the dangers attending idleness, find in these extraordinary labors food for their faculties, and a stimulant to their zeal, learn from the experience of their confréres in whose labors they participate, and finally place themselves in closer contact with the immense needs of souls.

VIII.

Great Catholic Works.

91. The work of recruiting the clergy by seeking out and cultivating vocations to the priesthood, shall be one of the principal duties for the members of the Union.

They shall guard with vigilance and cherish with very peculiar affection the children in whom they may have discovered the germs of this precious vocation, and if they can, they shall prepare them to enter the seminary, by teaching them the first rudiments of letters and by making them go piously through the ceremonies of the Church.

92. They shall second other works which have for object the general interest of the Church and the salvation of souls:—the *Apostleship of prayer*, which brings Christians to make the interests of the Heart of Jesus their interests and which directs all their prayers and good works to the triumphs of these divine interests—*Association of the propagation of the Faith*, which to the alms of prayer joins material aid—the *Holy Childhood*, which, in procuring the grace of Baptism for infidel children, produces so many happy results among christian children.

IX.

Particular Admonitions to Pastors and Their Assistants.

93. The knowledge and love of the Heart of Jesus will be of great utility to *priests entrusted with the care of souls*. The charity of this divine Heart shall leave them no repose until they have led back all their flock to the fold. They must not wait until the members of their flock come to seek them in the church; but the pastors should seek the stray sheep, and charity, which should be above all rebuffs, will suggest a thousand expedients to make themselves well received. Their kindness to children, their compassion for the sick, their sympathy in trials will open doors which were previously closed to their zeal. They shall consider it a duty to visit each year every house in their parish, and their kindness on such occasions, should effect that their visit will be regarded as a favor. They shall show as much meekness and patience in awaiting the success of divine grace, as constancy and zeal in promoting it.

94. They shall hold themselves on their guard against any influence or even its appearance from persons of the opposite sex, however respectable these might be ; and they shall beware of so-called pious souls, who have the pernicious art of bringing discredit upon priests whom they think they are serving, and of sowing discord in parishes.

An article in reference to the Apostolic Union of Secular Priests was published in the October number, 1880, of the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. A manual containing the history, rules and decisions referring to the Union was subsequently printed by the *Messenger* from which the above Rule is taken.

THE QUESTION OF CATHEDRATICUM.

To the Editor of the American Ecclesiastical Review.

At a recent gathering of the priests in one of the dioceses of Ontario, the question was discussed whether or not there is really an obligation for the priests of this province to pay to the Bishops the tax known as the Cathedraticum, and if the obligation exists, how far does it extend?

The following is the text of the decree of the first Council of the Province of Toronto held in A. D. 1875:

Decretum XXI.

Per decretum Sacrae Congregationis "de Propaganda Fide," datum Romae die 6 Julii, 1852, et a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Pio Papa IX. approbatum, permissum est ut pro episcopis sustentandis, praecipue in Dioecesibus recentius erectis, muniisque Episcopalibus obeundis, singuli Parochi seu missionarii vices parochorum gerentes, pro decima parte reddituum onerarentur, donec aliter a Sede Apostolica provideretur. Jam vero, Patres hujususce Concilii, hoc suo decreto, decernunt ut indultum istud apostolicum, in tota hac provincia observari deberet, et ubi nondum fuerit, invalere incipiat.

The receipts or revenues which are declared to be subject to this tax for the support of the Bishops are:

First, All pew rents; *Second*, Offertory collections; *Third*, Baptismal and Marriage offerings; *Fourth*, Pastoral dues which are paid by the congregation for the support of the priest; *Fifth*, Voluntary offerings of the people given to the parish priest at Christmas and Easter.

The indult of Pope Pius IX by which it is claimed that the levy of one-tenth on those sources of revenue is authorized, is as follows:

De Parte Decima.

Archiepiscopus et Episcopi Ecclesiasticae Provinciæ Canadensis per R. P. D. Joannem Carolum Prince Episcopum deputatum ad Apostolicam Sedem, exposuerunt redditus ad sustentandos Episcopos, atque ad Episcapolia obeunda munia, praecipue in Dioecesibus recentius erectis esse exiguos et communiter ex fidelium pietate provideri.

Omnibus vero rite perpensis in generali conventu habito die 17 Maii, 1852, referente Emo. ac Revmo. Dno. Cardinali Ludovico Altierio Emi. Patres censuerunt permittendum Archiepiscopo et Episcopis ut pro decima parte reddituum singuli Parochi seu missionarii vices Parochorum fungentes onerari possint, donec aliter a Sede Apostolica provideatur. Hanc vero S. Congregationis sententiam SSmo. Dno. Nro. Pio Papa IX. ab infrascripto ejusdem Secretario relatam Sanctitas sua benigne probari servarique praecepit, contrariis quibuscumque nonobstantibus.

Datum Romae ex aedibus S. Cognis. de Propda. Fide, die 6 Julii, 1852.

J. PH. *Card.* FRANZONI, *Praef.*

On the maxim, recognized in canon law as a principle of interpretation of all positive laws "Verba valent quantum sonant," one of the priests maintained that XXI decree of the Toronto Council as quoted above is of no legislative force.

First.—It will be noted that the provincial decree only states that the Pope's indult is to be observed in future. Now the Pope's indult does not make any regulation which is to be obeyed. It merely gives authority to the Bishops to make such regulation: but have they not failed to do so?

They have only asserted that they have authority to make a law requiring payment of one tenth of the church revenues in each parish. But apparently they have not made the law. It is maintained; therefore, that the XXI decree of the Toronto Council has no effect.

Second.—It will also be remarked that the decree of the Toronto Council professes to quote the Pope's decree, but it quotes it inaccurately.

The Pope's decree states that the Bishops shall have authority to tax the parish priests to the extent of one-tenth of their revenues. But the Toronto Council states that the parish priests are permitted by the Pope to pay one-tenth of their revenues to their Bishops; and it is only this interpretation of the Pope's indult which is declared to be put into force.

I therefore request you to answer the following queries:

First.—Can we assert that the XXI decree of the Toronto Council is not obligatory but is simply permissive, allowing the priests to pay one-tenth of their revenues to the Bishop if they see fit?

Second.—Are the Bishops justified in demanding one-tenth of the voluntary offerings of the people, given to the parish priest at Christmas and Easter, or given at any other time, altogether apart from their obligatory payment of parochial dues?

Third.—From the wording of the indult are we justified in inferring that the right to demand one-tenth of the revenues, as above, was given to the Bishops with reluctance?

Fourth.—It can be shown that the condition of the Ontario dioceses has very much changed since the indult was granted in 1852: the Catholic population of Ontario has about doubled and the Catholic wealth has more than doubled, so that the Episcopal revenues are very large and the payment of one-tenth has become very onerous on pastors who are endeavoring to build churches or pay for those erected within the last few years.

What would be the best course for the pastors to adopt in these circumstances to induce the Holy See to repeal the indult?

What number of pastors would be requisite to join in the course you may suggest?

Fifth.—Can the payment of one-tenth be enforced under penalty of suspension, or any other penalty under the law as it now exists and as quoted above?

The phrase in the indult: "Praecipue in dioecesibus recentius erectis" seems to imply a limitation of time although very indefinite.

Does it imply that the Holy See will readily repeal the permission if petitioned to that effect by a few priests, or does it imply that the Bishops themselves are obliged to lower the tax as soon as their income becomes more than adequate? I am,

Yours very respectfully,

A CANADIAN PRIEST.

Ans. We fail to see how the decree of the Toronto Council can be interpreted as having no effect. The obvious reason of the Episcopate requesting the Holy See to sanction a method of canonically providing a fixed revenue for the Bishops of the Province was the fact that they had no other regular source of sustenance, and that they intended to make use of this mode of securing it.

As for the obligation of supporting the Bishop by what is commonly called *Cathedraticum* or *honor cathedrae*, it is founded upon an ancient canonical right which requires no definition except as to the manner of its execution. This is regulated by the diocesan synod, whence we have the word *synodaticum*, used by canonists in the same sense as *cathedraticum*.

Besides the regular tax for the maintenance of the episcopal household, which is levied under a title similar to that which the pastor holds for his support by the congregation which he serves, the Bishop may exact the *procuratio canonica*, that is to say, a certain stipend to defray the accidental expenses of his annual visitation. Where the *subsidium charitativum* (originally a voluntary contribution towards defraying all expenses incurred by the Bishop outside of the ordinary maintenance of his household) has been introduced it likewise obligatory.

This obligation exists wherever the poverty of a church, or special exemption, does not render it void.

If, as our reverend correspondent maintains, the synodal decrees do not explicitly state that the obligation which corresponds to this right on the part of the Bishops, exists in the case of every parish priest, it may have been for good reasons. Apart from the fact that the request of an indult from the Holy See regarding the exercise of a right takes the right, and hence the correlative obligation on the part of the clergy necessarily for granted, it may have been the intention of the Bishops not to avail themselves definitely of this privilege of collecting the tenth part in certain cases where the priests labor under special difficulties in supporting their charge; whilst at the same time those who can afford the specified tax would have no claim to its reduction.

Nor can we understand the wording of the Toronto Council, as given by our correspondent, to mean that "the parish priests are permitted by the Pope to pay one-tenth of their revenues to their Bishops." Surely the expression "permissum est ut parochi . . . . . pro decima parte reddituum onerarentur" cannot be tortured into any such meaning, since it is the very opposite,

namely, that "the parish priest *may be obliged* to pay one-tenth part of his revenues to his Bishop."

With this preamble the answers to the above stated queries are simple.

I.—The XXI Decree of the Toronto Council as cited by our correspondent is obligatory except in so far as the Bishops individually or collectively may relinquish their claim to the tenth part of the church revenues as specified by the synodal decree.

II.—The Bishop according to the Pontifical indult may exact the tenth part of the *regular* income of the churches under their jurisdiction which includes the Christmas and Easter collections, since these are apparently a fixed source of income for the clergy. As for donations given privately and accidentally outside of the church they are not included, because they must be considered as personal favors to which the parish priest as such can lay no claim in justice.

III.—There is nothing to indicate that the Holy See granted the indult reluctantly.

IV.—If it can be shown that the condition of the Ontario dioceses has very much changed since the indult was granted, and that "the Catholic wealth has more than doubled, so that episcopal revenues are very large," it may be presumed that the churches have likewise grown in prosperity. But suppose this not to be the case; a pastor is not obliged to pay the cathedraticum unless he is able to do so. An appeal to the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIV, cap. 3, de ref.) would justify him on the ground of poverty; but in any case he must first apply to the Bishop for a reduction or an exemption, and give proof to the Holy See that his revenue is inadequate to meet the required tax sanctioned by the indult.

V.—Rome would unquestionably revoke the indult if it could be demonstrated (not merely asserted by "a few priests") that the episcopate exacts an exorbitant revenue from a poor clergy.

A CASE OF RESTITUTION.

Qu. Some thirty years ago this State was for the most part an open prairie; but cattle and hogs were not allowed to run at large. A bad year came and some of the farmers had no grain to feed. A poor land-holder, under these circumstances, turns out his shoats to live or die. They wander along to another farmer's place, break into his field and begin to destroy his crop. He knowing whose hogs they are and that the owner having no feed for them, has turned them loose to live or die, takes up the shoats, feeds and fattens and sells them as his own.

"Maybe it was wrong and maybe he is suffering for it," says his wife to me after the man's death. "The party to whom the shoats belonged never claimed them, though he certainly knew we had them—And what would he claim them for; sure he had nothing to feed them with and wouldn't till the next fall; and small good that would be doing the poor shoats then."

The person to whom the hogs belonged is gone.

Is the wife of the farmer who appropriated the animals bound to restitution in his behalf?

If so to what extent—the price of the shoats, or the entire amount received from the sale less the care and feed?

Resp. There is here no obligation to make restitution; for such obligation could arise only from one or both of two causes, namely, the unlawful *retention of another's property* (res aliena detenta), or *an act by which injury is inflicted* (actio injuste damnificans).

Neither of the two causes obtain here, for the owner of the hogs, in turning them at large to live or die, relinquished his formal possession of them. They became what moral theologians call a *res derelicta, i. e.*, abandoned objects. And to such applies the principle, "Fiunt primi occupantis." He who finds them may appropriate them since they have ceased to belong to their original owner, who cannot be interpreted as justly wishing to prevent their appropriation by another so long as he explicitly abandoned his own claim. Hence Lehmkuhl and other moral theologians consider it lawful to take possession of animals which bear marks of having been formerly domesticated, but were allowed to go wild, having lost the domestic instinct. "Animilia mansuefacta tamdiu manent in dominio detinentis quamdu non evaserunt efferata neque consuetudinem revertendi amiserint. Quod si obtinuerit, fiunt primi occupantis." (Theol. moral. Vol. i. n. 909.)

Moreover, the original owner, as is stated in the case, was aware of the fact that his neighbor profited by the condition which caused him to abandon the hogs, and he made, it seems, neither remonstrance nor claim to regain them later, which proves that he fully relinquished his possession for good.

It may be said that the new owner *took advantage of the necessity* of his neighbor and was thus guilty of a species of extortion. But we would answer that to take advantage of another's necessity is not always equivalent to an injustice. It would be more accurate to say that the original owner, by reason of his own necessity, *gave an advantage* to his neighbor which the latter was not bound to forego, because his act of sheltering and feeding the hogs did not injure the other, nor was it intended to do so. On the contrary, the

abandoned property became a source of injury to himself for which he could claim compensation, and as this was not likely to be given, he might, if the damage was considerable, have rendered the trespassing animals innoxious by killing them. (Cf. Lehmk. l. c. n. 912.)

It would be a different case if the farmer who took possession of the hogs had brought about the want of feed and thus forced his neighbor to abandon the shoats. In that supposition the duty of restitution would arise from the second cause, namely, "actio injuste damnificans." But there is no reason to assume this. The original owner might have offered the hogs to his neighbor for sale; but the latter was not bound to buy and perhaps the conditions of place did not allow of such a transaction or make it worth while.

As the ownership of the animals presents a clear title of *prima occupatio rei derelictae*, the right of selling them at a profit is equally lawful,—especially as the care and feeding together with any damage done by the first inroad entitle the new possessor to some return.

Our decision, which is given on purely moral grounds, precludes from any positive civil legislation which might exist to settle doubtful claims regarding the ownership of live stock, in districts where territorial limits are barely defined. The mutual recognition of such laws by the several parties in dispute would modify the answer as to the relative obligation in *foro externo* even though there be no duty of making restitution in *foro interno* or conscience.

A QUESTION OF LITURGICAL OBSERVANCE.

Qu. A priest has an out-mission where he gives Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament on Sundays. Now as he does not like to carry the sacred Host on the train amid much distraction, he adopts the following expedient: He finishes the Mass, but does not take the ablution. After Mass he gives Benediction, then consumes the sacred Particle of the lunette and drinks the ablutions. Can it be tolerated?

Resp. Surely not. The consumption of the Most Blessed Sacrament by the celebrant outside of Mass is lawful only in cases of actual necessity, among which is generally included that of a priest receiving the viaticum on the same day on which he has said Mass having had no premonition of approaching death.

In the present case the communion received at the Mass which is ended, and the consumption of the large Host after Benediction are

distinct and separated acts; nor does the fact of the celebrant having remained fasting to the end alter this condition. The liturgical law is against it and the dictum "communiter nemini, ne sacerdoti quidem extra celebrationem Missae licet sibi ipsi S. Communionem sumere" finds in an appropriate sense its application here.

If the inconvenience of the journey and the danger of irreverence to the Most Blessed Sacrament be urged it must be remembered that the system of allowing individual discretion to alter the liturgical laws of the Church is wrought with far greater danger of irreverence. The fulfillment of our sacred ministry presents a thousand inconveniences which we can only deprive of their sting of being offensive to God and injurious to souls by rectifying our intention and doing the best we can to compensate for the want of external honor by interior reverence.

The laws of God and of His Church, even in minor details, require our adaptation where they have not been modified by the authority which gives them force. Here a dispensation from observing the rubric which provides for conveying the Most Blessed Sacrament to the Tabernacle as its proper place of reposition, and the general law which prohibits the reception of Holy Communion twice on the same day, except in special cases, cannot be presumed.

ANALECTA.

DISSOLUTIO MATRIMONII CONVERSORUM IN FAVOREM FIDEI.

A.—*Quaestiones.*

I. Quaeritur utrum dispensatio a vinculo matrimonii, quae dari solet ab Ecclesia, positis ponendis, post baptismum unius partis, potest applicari in casu in quo post baptismum unius, duae partes non cessarunt habere connexionem, et consummarunt matrimonium sicut ante baptismum?

II. Matrimonium valide contractum ante baptismum inter duos infideles potestne dissolvi, quando, post baptismum unius, pars infidelis promittit quidem se non inquietare mulierem baptizatam in professione Christianitatis, sed ille recusat dimittere alias uxores illegitimas, vel non vult promittere se servaturum leges Evangelii circa monogamiam?

III. In casu praecedenti, si matrimonium dissolvi potest, mulier baptizata teneturne recurrere ad dispensationem pro dissolutione matrimonii?

IV. Mulier baptizata potestne recurrere ad dispensationem, quando praenoscit quod, facta dissolutione matrimonii, educatio prolis susceptae penitus erit in potestate viri ejus infidelis?

V. Si dispensatio dari non potest, mulier legitima quae fit christiana, post conversionem potestne cohabitare cum marito infideli qui simul in eadem domo retinet uxores alias illegitimas?

VI. Puella christiana, obtenta dispensatione disparitatis cultus, potestne legitime contrahere matrimonium cum infideli qui non promittit se a polygamia abstinere in futurum

VII. Bertha, adhuc infidelis, contrahit Matrimonium cum infideli statim ac pervenit ad annos pubertatis; et post duos annos relinquit virum suum, nulla suscepta prole, et ambo currunt ad alias nuptias, imo vir accipit plurimas uxores et fit polygamus. Sed nunc mulier aetate provecta, audito missionario, vult baptizari: potestne illa mulier dispensari a vinculo matrimonii contracti cum primo marito, non postulato consensu ejus, et sic remanere cum secundo marito ex quo illa suscepit prolem?

VIII. Apud quosdam infideles detestabilis viget consuetudo juxta quam vir, post commissum adulterium cum uxero alterius, administrat remedium uxori adulterae, cujus effectus erit inferre mortem super legitimum maritum, eo ipso quod postea habebit connexionem cum uxore sua. Unde postulatur utrum vir legitimus, qui nolit cohabitare cum uxero sua post adulterium commissum, si convertitur ad fidem poterit dispensari a vinculo matrimonii sui contracti in infidelitate, et ducere alteram uxorem, etiamsi infidelis uxor adultera vellet et ipsa baptizari?

B.—*Responsum.*

EE. et RR. PP. ad singula postulata responderunt (11. Juli 1886, ad Vicarium Apostol. Natal.), juxta sequentem modum, hisce tamen praenotatis :

1. Supra scripta postulata intelligi de privilegio a Christo Domino in favorem fidei concesso et per Apostolum Paulum I ad Cor. VIII, 12 seq. promulgato.

2. Hoc privilegium divinum in eo consistere, quod, stante matrimonio legitime in infidelitate contracto et consummato, si conjugum alter Christianam fidem amplectitur, renuente altero in sua infidelitate obdurato cohabitare cum converso, aut cohabitare quidem volente sed non sine contumelia Creatoris, hoc est non sine periculo subversionis conjugis fidelis, vel non sine exsecratione sanctissimi nominis Christi et christianae religionis despicientia, tunc integrum sit converso transire ad alia vota postquam infidelis interpellatus aut absolute recusaverit cum eo cohabitare, aut animum sibi esse ostenderit cum illo quidem cohabitare sed non sine Creatoris contumelia.

3. Juxta item divinum privilegium, conjugem conversum ad fidem, in ipso conversionis pacto non intelligi solutum a vinculo matrimonii cum infideli adhuc superstite contracti, sed tunc, si conjux infidelis renuat, acquirere jus transeundi ad alias nuptias cum tamen conjuge fideli. Ceterum tunc solum conjugii vinculum dissolvi, quando conjux conversus transit cum effectu ad alias nuptias.

Hinc :

Ad I. Si quando evenerit ut stante duorum infidelium matrimonio, alter conjugum ad fidem conversus baptismum susceperit atque cum infideli conjuge pacifice et sine contumelia Creatoris cohabitaverit, si postmodum infidelis, quin tamen pars fidelis rationabile motivum dederit discedendi, nedum converti recusaverit, sed insuper fracta fide de pacifica cohabitatione aut odio religionis discesserit, aut sine contumelia Creatoris cohabitare noluerit, vel fidelem ad peccatum mortale aut ad infidelitatem trahere tentaverit, integrum erit conjugi fideli ad alia vota transire.

Ad II. Si agatur de uxore pagana alicujus pagani concubinarii quae convertitur, tunc, facta interpellatione, si renuat converti aut cohabitare absque injuria Creatoris ac proinde desinere a concubinatu, qui sine injuria Creatoris certe haberi nequit, poterit uti privilegio in favorem fidei concesso.

Ad III. Quando conjux infidelis rite interpellatus, aut absolute recusaverit cum conjuge ad fidem converso cohabitare aut animum sibi esse ostenderit cum illo quidem cohabitandi, sed non sine Creatoris contumelia, vel absque eo quod se a concubinatu abstinere perpetuo velit, tunc conjux conversus, praehabito superioris ecclesiastici judicio, separari debet ab Infideli, et poterit, si velit, uti privilegio seu divina dispensatione in favorem fidei concessa, et sic ad alia vota transire, cum persona fideli.

Ad IV. Si conjugi converso impossibele prorus sit filios e potestate alterius conjugis in infidelitate obdurati subducere, nec fas sit, praemissa juridica et formali interpellatione, cum eo cohabitare, vel quia ille non vult vel non sine contumelia Creatoris vult cohabitare, praehabito judicio superioris ecclesiastici, integrum erit ad alia vota transire, firma tamen manente ob-

ligatione, qua semper tenetur, curandi, si quo modo poterit, catholicam filiorum educationem.

Ad V. Provisum in praecedentibus.

Ad VI. Negative ; et in similibus casibus Missionarii, qui ex concessione Apostolica pollent facultate dispensandi super disparitate cultus, caveant ne dispensationem concedant, nisi remoto polygamiae periculo.

Ad VII. Quum agitur, uti supponitur, de matrimonio legitimo in infidelitate contracto, mulier separetur a secundo viro omnino et cum effectu ; et si ob gravissimas causas et realem impotentiam separari nequeat quoad habitationem, separetur saltem quoad totum in consuetudinem, nullum amplius habens cum eodem viro tractum, aut carnale commercium. Deinde de more instruatur, ei praecipue notificando, quod suscepto baptismo non dispensetur ab obligatione quam habet redeundi ad primum maritum ; et quatenus post debitam instructionem constet eam moveri ad accipiendum baptismum ex vero religionis motivo, admittatur statim ad baptismum, eoque collato, interpelletur omnino primus vir, et interrogetur utrum converti velit aut sine contumelia Creatoris cum ea vitam traducturus sit, et de omnibus resultantibus R. P. D. Vicarius Apostolicus Sacram Congregationem certiorem faciat. Quod si vero summarie saltem, et extrajudicialiter constet conjugem in infidelitate relictum adeo esse absentem ut moneri legitime non possit, aut monitum intra tempus in monitione praefixum, suam voluntatem non significavisse vel, si adiri quidem possit conjux infidelis, sed de comparte jam facta Christiana interpellari nequeat sine evidenti gravis damni ei vel christianis inferendi periculo, quin hujusmodi damna cum necessaria circumspectione et cautela removeri possint, haec omnia Apostolicae Sedi renuntiabit Vicarius Apostolicus, expressis nominibus et ex expositis gravissimis causis pro obtinenda dispensatione super impedimento dirimenti disparitatis cultus, si praetensus secundus vir adhuc in infidelitate persistat, et narratis omnibus rerum personarum et facti adjunctis, ut in re tam gravis momenti procedi tuto possit.

Ad VIII. Matrimonium etiam in infidelitate contractum natura sua est indissolubile, et tunc solum quoad vinculum dissolvi potest virtute privilegii in favorem fidei a Christo Domino concessi et per Apostolum Paulum promulgati, quando conjugum alter Christianam fidem amplectitur et alter nedum a fide amplectenda omnino renuit, sed nec vult pacifice cum conjuge converso cohabitare absque injuria Creatoris, ideoque non esse locum dissolutioni quoad vinculum matrimonii legitime contracti in infidelitate, quando ambo conjuges baptismum susceperunt vel suscipere intendunt.

4. Decr. d. d. 7. Nov. 1888.

ABSOLUTIO A CASIBUS ET CENSURIS RESERVATIS S. SEDI APOST.

A.—*Quaestio.*

Eminentissime Domine.

Post decretum S. Cong. R. et U. Inquisitionis absolutionem a casibus Rom. Pontifici spectans, datum sub die 23. Junii 1886, sequentia dubia occurrunt mihi missionario, quorum nequidem in recentioribus auctoribus solutionem reperire mihi possibile est ; quapropter hanc ab Eminentia Vestra sollicite imploro.

I. Decreti responsio ad Im quae sic se habet: "Attenta praxi S. Poenitentiariae, praesertim ab edita Constitutione Apostolica s. m. Pii IX. quae incipit *Apostolicae Sedis*, negative," non videtur respicere casus specialiter reservatos Summo Pontifici sine censura; siquidem de his non agitur in Constitutione *Apostolicae Sedis*. Numquid ergo integra manet vetus doctrina theologorum dicentium de his absolvere posse episcopos vel eorum delegatos, vel, ut vult Castropalao, simplicem sacerdotem, quando poenitens Romam nequit petere, quin scribere necesse sit?

II. Quando indultum quinquennale Episcopi habent a S. Congregatione de Propaganda Fide, complectens 14 numeros et n° 10° concedens facultatem absolvendi ab omnibus casibus etiam specialiter reservatis R. P., excepto casu absolventis complicem, numquid illam possunt delegare in Gallia et in Europa pro casu saltem particulari? ita ut non necessarium sit ut poenitens adeat episcopum ipsum, quamvis in n° 12° indulti sit haec clausula: "Communicandi has facultates in totum vel in partem prout opus esse secundum ejus conscientiam judicaverit, sacerdotibus idoneis in conversione animarum laborantibus in locis tantum ubi prohibetur exercitium catholicae religionis?"

III. Posito quod negative respondeatur, quid si poenitenti impossibile sit adire episcopum tale indultum habentem?

IV. Quando sedes episcopalis vacat, numquid vicarius capitularis potest communicare facultates quinquennales episcopo amoto vel defuncto concessas per indultum S. Poenitentiariae vel Congregationis de Propaganda Fide?

V. Certe hodie integra viget facultas a Tridentino concessa episcopis absolvendi a simpliciter reservatis occultis, sed quaeritur utrum tale decretum attingat casus simpliciter reservatos eodem modo ac specialiter reservatos Summo Pontifici?

VI. Quando missionario occurrit poenitens censuris innodatus et transiens obiter, ita ut missionarius non possit iterum poenitentem videre, numquid sufficit, posito casu urgentiori absolutionis, exigere a poenitente promissionem scribendi, tacito si vult nomine, ad S. Poenitentiariam intra mensem, et standi illius mandatis, quin confessarius ipse scribat?

VII. Utrum, tuta conscientia, docetur et in praxim deducitur, ut quidam volunt, propter hodiernum periculum ne aperiantur epistolae a potestate civili, non requiri ut epistola ad Summum Pontificem dirigatur in casibus urgentioribus vel quando adiri nequit Papa?

VIII. Posito quod non requiratur epistola ad Summum Pontificem, numquid requiratur epistola directa ad episcopum, stante hoc generali periculo, praesertim quando agitur de absolutione complicis, quae etiam perfidiose detecta et revelata scandalum generare potest?

Horum dubiorum solutionem ab Eminentia Vestra fiducialiter expectans et Ejus sacram purpuram exosculans,

Illius, humillimum et addictissimum servum me fateor.

B.—*Responsum.*

Sacra Poenitentiaria, mature consideratis expositis, ad proposita dubia respondet:

Ad Im. *Negative.*

Ad IIm, IIIm, et IVm. *Orator consulat Episcopum, et, quatenus opus sit, idem Episcopus recurrat ad Sacram Supremam Congregationem universalis Inquisitionis.*

Ad Vm. *Affirmative, nisi casus sint occulti.*

Ad VIm. *Affirmative.*

Ad VIIm. *Negative, cum in precibus nomina et cognomina sint supprimenda.*

Ad VIIIm. *Provisum in VII°.*

DECRETA CIRCA DISPENSAT. IN ARTICULO MORTIS.

a) — *Ad Archiepiscopum Compostellanum.*.

Illme et Rme Domine,

Litteris datis non multis ab hinc diebus quaerebat Amplitudo Tua, utrum vi decretorum diei 20. Februarii 1888 et 1. Martii 1889 valeant Ordinarii per se vel per parochos dispensare super impedimentis publicis juris ecclesiastici, exceptis presbyteratu et affinitate in linea recta, omnes in articulo mortis constitutos, licet matrimonium civile, quod vocant., non celebraverint nec vivant in concubinatu.

Res delata est ad Emos DD. Cardinales una mecum Inquisitores generales, qui in Congregatione habita feria IV. die 17 currentis mensis respondendum mandarunt : *Negative.*

Quod dum significo, fausta quaeque Ampl. Tuae precor a Domino.

Datum Romae die 22. Septembris 1890.

Addictissimus in Domino.

R. Car. *Monaco.*

Dno. Achiep. Compostellano.

b) — *Ad Episcopum Vicensem* (= Vich.)

Beatissime Pater,

Episcopus Vicensis ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus sequens reverenter exponit dubium. Ex litteris istius S. R. et U. Inquisitionis diei 20. Februarii 1888, "Sanctitas Tua benigne annuit pro gratia, qua locorum Ordinarii dispensare valeant aegrotos in gravissimo mortis periculo constitutos super impedimentis quantumvis publicis matrimonium jure ecclesiastico dirimentibus, excepto sacro presbyteratus Ordine et affinitate lineae rectae ex copula licita proveniente." Jamvero super intelligentia verborum "aegrotos in gravissimo mortis periculo constitutos," non leve exortum est inter quosdam dissidium. Sunt enim qui asserant locum dispensationi tantum ese, quum impedimentum afficiat directe aegrotum, non vero quum aegrotus sit solutus, et impedimentum tantum directe afficiat bene valentem. Dum alii e contra facultatem dispensandi Ordinariis concedi putant, quamvis aegrotans non habeat in se impedimentum, sed hoc directe tantum existat in bene valente. Unde quum civiliter sint conjuncti, aut alias in concubinatu vivant, ex gr., puella soluta et Diaconus, illaque aegrotante, hic valens sit, possetne Ordinarius cum his dispensare? Vel si monialis aegrotans in concubinatu viveret cum Diacono bene valente, essetne locus

dispensationi, quum Diaconus non sit in gravissimo mortis periculo constitutus?

Feria IV, die 1. Julii 1891.

In Congne Genli S. Rom. et U. Inquis. proposita suprascripta instantia, praehabitoque Rvmorum DD. Consultorum voto, Emi ac Rmi Dni Cardinales in rebus fidei et morum Generales Inquis. respondendum mandarunt: *Ordinarios locorum, vi Decreti diei 20. Februarii 1888, in utroque casu allato dispensare posse, et in utroque pariter S. Congregnem S. Officii de impertita dispensatione certiorem reddere, ac ea interim curare debere, quae in eodem decreto praescribuntur.* Sequenti vero die SSmus D. N. Leo div. prov. Pp. XIII. in audientia R. P. D. Adssessori S. O. impertita, relatam sibi Emorum Patrum resolutionem benigne adprobare dignatus est.

J. Mancini, S. R. et U. I. Not.

THE "ORDOS" OF QUEBEC, MONTREAL AND OTTAWA.

Dubium.

Emus et Rmus Dom. Alexander Taschereau, Archiepiscopus Quebecensis una cum Rmis Antistitibus Marianopolitano et Ottaviensi ab Apostolica sede humillime postulant:

1mo. Ut Juxta calendarium pro tribus suis ecclesiasticis Provinciis nuper approbatum ac juxta recentiores Rubricas liceat sibi reformare calendaria particularia ecclesiarum et publicorum oratoriorum intra fines suarum Archidioecesium respective existentium; 2d. Ut festis propriis ecclesiarum atque Oratoriorum publicorum, non excepto festo Titulari, eaedem dies assignari valeant, quibus inscriptae sunt in respectivo Calendario Dioecesano, servato jure ad integram octavae celebrationem.

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio ad relationem infrascripti Secretarii, exquisitoque voto alterius ex Apostolicorum Ceremoniarum Magistris, ita proposit is postulatis rescribendum censuit, videlicet:

Ad. I. *Affirmative.*

Ad. II. *Non Expedire.*

Atque ita rescripsit die 2 Maii, 1892.

† CAJ. *Card.* ALOISI-MASELLA, *Praefectus.*

VINCENTIUS NUSSI, *Secretarius.*

CONGREGATION OF THE INDEX.

Feria V, die 14 Julii, 1892.

Sacra Congregatio Eminentissimorum ac Reverendissimorum Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinalium a Sanctissimo Domino Nostro Leone Papa XIII Sanctaque Sede Apostolica Indici librorum pravae doctrinae, eorumdemque proscriptioni, expurgationi ac permissioni in universa christiana

Republica praepositorum et delegatorum, habita in Palatio Apostolico Vaticano die 14 Julii, 1892, damnavit et damnat, proscripsit proscribitque, vel alias damnata atque proscripta in Indicem librorum prohibitorum referri mandavit et mandat quae sequuntur Opera :

Anelli Abb. Luigi.—I Riformatori nel Secolo XVI—volumi 2. Milano, 1891.

Mantegazza Paolo —Igiene dell'Amore—Terza impressione dell'edizione del 1889 —Milano, 1891.

Fisiologia dell' odio —Milano, 1889.

Epicuro—Saggio di una fisiologia del bello.—Milano, 1891.

Epicuro II—Dizionario delle cose belle—Milano 1892.

L'arte di prender moglie—Milano 1892.

Graf Arturo—Il Diavolo.—Milano, Fratelli Treves Editori.

Uzard Prof. Leopoldo.—Storia del Diavolo, illustrata splendidamente da 50 disegni.—E. Perino Editore, Roma 1892.

Libro di Divozioni per le diverse ore della giornata e le principali feste del l'anno, aggiuntovi il matutino, i vespri, i notturni, ed i salmi penitenziali.—Piccola Biblioteca di libri devoti, edita dalla rivista Cuore e Critica. —Savona.

Il mese di Maggio (Strenna per nozze)—(A. Ghisleri compilatore).—Bergamo. Fr. Catteneo succ. Gaffuri e Gatti.

Ansault M. l'Abbé.—Le culte de la Croix avant Jésus-Christ. 1. La Croix avant Jésus-Christ (extrait du Correspondant).—Paris, 1889.

Le culte de la Croix avant Jésus-Christ. Réponse à M. De Harlez professeur à l' Université de Louvain (extrait de la Science catholique).—Emile Colin, Imprimerie de Lagny, 1890.

Mémoire sur le culte de la Croix avant Jésus-Christ.—Paris, 1891.—(Auctor laudabiliter se subjecit et opuscula reprobavit.)

Renan Ernest.—Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse.—Paris, 1883.

Feuilles détachées faisant suite aux Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse. —Paris, 1892.

De Régla Paul.—Jésus de Nazareth au point de vue Historique, Scientifique et Social.—Paris, 1891.

Itaque nemo cuiuscumque gradus et conditionis praedicta Opera damnata atque proscripta, quocumque loco et quocumque idiomate, aut in posterum edere, aut edita legere vel retinere audeat, sed locorum Ordinariis, aut haereticae pravitatis Inquisitoribus ea tradere teneantur, sub poenis in Indice librorum vetitorum indictis.

Quibus Sanctissimo Domino nostro Leoni Papae XIII per me infrascriptum S. I. C. a Secretis relatis, Sanctitas sua Decretum probavit, et promulgari praecepit. In quorum fidem, etc.

Datum Romae die 14 Iullii, 1892.

CAMILLUS *Card.* MAZZELLA *Praef.* FR. HYACINTHUS FRATI. O. P. *a Secretis.* Loco ✠ Sigilli.

Die 5 Augusti, 1892, ego infrascriptus Mag. Cursorum testor supradictum Decretum affixum et publicatum fuisse in Urbe.

Vincentius Benagalia, Mag. Curs.

DE CONGREGATIONE BONÆ MORTIS.

Dubia.

Congregatio Primaria quæ *Bonæ Mortis* nuncupatur sub invocatione D. N. Jesu Christi in Cruce morientis ac Beatissimæ Virginis Mariæ ejus Geni tricis perdolentis finem habet, ut fideles ad mortem quam felicissime obeundam rite disponantur per jugem passionis Christi memoriam ejusque publice privatimque recolendæ studium, et in primis per vitam recte christianeque institutam.

Hujus vero Primariæ Congregationis statuta generalia definiunt quædam pia exercitia in communi peracta, ita ut sodales conveniant in Ecclesiam Congregationis, vel singulis sextis feriis aut diebus Dominicis, vel saltem semel aut bis in mense, et in his piis cœtibus conciones habeantur et preces una simul a Sodalibus fundantur.

Quum autem Congregationum *Bonæ Mortis* quæ per diversas Orbis partes eriguntur statuta peculiaria originalibus statutis, supra recensitis, sint conformanda, quantum tempora et locorum adjuncta suadebunt, ideo quæritur:

I. Utrum Primariæ aggregari possit Congregatio *Bonæ Mortis* quæ sub invocatione tantum Sancti Josephi erigeretur, omisso omnino titulo D. N. Jesu Christi in cruce morientis et B. V. M. perdolentis, et cujus statuta nullam habent mentionem de piis conventibus atque exercitationibus supradictis pro certis diebus, et tantummodo præscribunt, ut fundantur preces pro unoquoque socio cum in agoniam devenerit, ut mortuos sodales ad sepulturam comitentur et eleemosynæ colligantur ad Missas pro sociis defunctis celebrandas: talis enim Congregatio non videretur esse ejusdem nominis et instituti?

II. An Episcopi qui gaudent indulto eis concedente erigendi in sua Diœcesi Confraternitates cum Indulgentiis quibus gaudent Archiconfraternitates ejusdem nominis et instituti in alma Urbe existentes, erigere valeant pias Sodalitates, uti supra expositum est, cum Indulgentiis concessis Primariæ Congregationi *Bonæ Mortis?*

Et quatenus negative:

III. Num petenda sit sanatio prædictarum piarum Unionum *Bonæ Mortis* in Diœcesi Albiensi erecturarum, assumptis tamen titulo Unionis primariæ etstatutis eidem conformibus prouti suadebunt adjuncta locorum in quibus jam erectæ sunt; an potius denuo erigendæ?

S. Congregatio indulgentiis sacrisque Reliquiis præposita, audito unius ex Consultoribus voto, præfatis dubiis respondit:

Ad I: *Negative.*

Ad II: *Negative.*

Ad III: Negative quoad primam partem: affirmative quoad secumdam; servato tamen Decreto nuper edito ab hac S. Congregatione sub die 17 Septembris, 1887. Datum Romae ex Secretaria S. C. I. die 17 Julii, 1891.

J., *Card.* D'ANNIBALE, *Praefectus.*

L. ✠ S. ALEX., *Archiep.* NICOP., *Secretarius.*

BOOK REVIEW.

SERMONS ON THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. By the Very Rev. D. I. McDermott, Rector of St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, Pa.—Wm. J. Carey, Philadelphia, 1892.

A book of sermons is not unfrequently a disappointment to the purchaser; for, however effective the spoken word may be as it comes from the preacher's lips, it inevitably weakens when committed to the printed page. There are exceptions to this rule as to all others, and among them we would single out the collection of discourses here presented. No doubt, those who have heard them, as delivered with the characteristic energy of their author, will miss some of the original strength; but still there is preserved here the clear precision of dogmatic statement, solid lines of well-sustained argument, the aptness and originality of illustration, and at least some of that vigor of style which acts so powerfully upon the hearer.

Father Faber somewhere makes a strong protest against mere sentiment in discoursing on our Blessed Lady. The Divine Maternity involves such a practically limitless fund of reality, that the logical mind, moved by genuine love, will scorn the empty phrase when speaking of Mary's position in the plan of redemption. It is with such mind that Father McDermott writes on our Blessed Lady. He does not aim at the merely emotional. Devotion, to be lasting, must rest on doctrine, as the heart must follow the head. In the light, therefore, of revelation, he explains the prerogatives of the Mother of Christ as they are, or rather as the human mind will grasp them. At the same time he does not fail to show, often in fervent, yet always subdued eloquence, how they entail reverence, love, gratitude, obedience and imitation on the part of her clients. In right carefully wrought discourses he treats of the Sorrows of Mary, of her Testimony as Queen of Prophets, of her Spiritual Motherhood as illustrated by the miracle at Cana, of the reasonableness of her Immaculate Conception, and the futility of the Protestant objections against this first of her privileges, of the history and nature of her Rosary, of the truths involved in her Holy Name.

The sermons of Father McDermott are likely to effect much good inasmuch as they cannot fail to arouse the reader to a genuine enthusiasm founded on the admiration and the love which they elicit for the Mother of our Divine Saviour.

F. P. S.

DIRECT LEGISLATION BY THE PEOPLE. By Nathan Cree.—Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1892.

This modest volume of 172 pages and six Appendices proposes the solution or the manifest difficulty which prevents a government democratic in form from being actually the expression of the popular will. Strangely enough our great Republic is invited to learn the wholesome lesson of reform from the smallest of her sister-republics in Europe.

Mr. Cree in a few short and concisely wri ten chapters points out that the Government of the United States is, virtually, government by parties, and that parties fail in many respects to express adequately the will of the people.

In his Introduction, after quoting Sir Henry Maine's reference to Switzerland in his "Popular Government," the author remarks "that, if the people of the United States are to develop still further in public spirit and intelligence, they will content themselves with nothing less than a general power to propose and enact laws directly, and a power to reject directly those enacted by legislative bodies for them."

This power of the popular will making itself felt directly, Mr. Cree thinks can be attained by adopting the *Initiative* and *Referendum*, now in force in Switzerland, and in Chapter xv, he submits a form of amendment to the constitution of the United States embodying the Swiss principle. How even this would overcome mere party government it is difficult to see for, as soon as any law, passed by Congress, or a State Legislature, would; have been submitted to the people by way of *Referendum*, the professional politicians of both parties would, no doubt, be able to excite party feeling one way or another, just as they do, now, at every election, and the particular law would be decided in the same manner in which A, B, or C is elected to-day, the result being that there would be so many more elections with all their attendant evils.

Even in the case of the *initiative*, or to be more precise, the imperative petition, it cannot be doubted that the professional politicians would be able to make themselves felt by suggesting to the electorate, through the press, subjects upon which to express their opinions. Mr. Cree well says that "the spirit of party is little but evil, and is full of danger. It poisons the public mind and prevents all impartial and high-toned action on most public affairs. Every man wishing for a public career, must swear fealty to it. The very highest question of state, the reform of the fundamental law, is generally treated in the spirit of party and turned into a party issue." And then he goes on to express the hope that "a method of political action permitting the electors to divide and act respecting all measures according to the views held of them touching their merits as specific proposals would dispense with the necessity of acting so often through the machinery of party." In a small country like Switzerland, where the physical conditions are pretty much the same throughout, and, in consequence, the material desires and necessities of its inhabitants are nearly alike, it may be possible to view public questions from this purely rational standpoint; but, in a country such as the United States, immense in extent and differing greatly

as to its physical conditions, with an enormous and heterogeneous population, it seems impossile that legislation can be regarded except as it affects this or that section. And such a state of things is and must be, the fruitful source of party government, wherever the democratic form prevails.

Mr. Cree's subject covers much ground which he has managed to compress into a narrow limit without being obscure or fragmentary. It would take a larger volume than he has written to criticise in detail his statements and we merely call attention to the book as likely to offer subject matter of thought to those who are intelligently interested in the questions involved in popular government.

W. R. C.

THE RITE OF A BISHOP'S CONSECRATION, explained by the Bishop of Burlington, on the occasion of the consecration of his coadjutor, the Rt. Rev. J. S. Michaud, June 29, 1892.—Burlington, Vt. Free Press Association.

This little pamphlet is not only a graceful tribute of a venerable and learned prelate to the younger brother who is to share the burden and the blessings of his episcopal charge but it is also an instructive exposition of the origin, nature and effects of the episcopal consecration, together with a succinct explanation of the insignia which distinguish the office of Bishop. It is a healthy sign of the desire there seems to exist among Catholics to enter more closely into the meaning of the sacred rites, that we should have had three publications of the same kind within a comparatively short period. One by Bishop Zardetti of St. Cloud; another, published as the first volume of the Liturgical Manuals' Series, and the present sketch which comes from a writer whose work in this field has long ago edified and instructed many.

FASTI MARIANI SIVE CALENDARIUM FESTORUM SANCTAE MARIAE VIRGINIS DEIPARAE. Memoriis historicis illustratum. Auctore F. G. Holweck, sacerdote Archiedioecesis S. Ludovici Americanae. Cum Approbatione Revmi Archiep. Friburg.—Friburgi Brisgoviae, Sumptibus Herder. MDCCCXCII. St. Louis, Mo. B. Herder.

A curious book full of research and marks of erudition which we would readily attribute to some learned monk of a past age if the title page did not assure us that the writer or compiler is an American priest. We remember, indeed, having seen parts of this work published under the caption *Fasti Mariani* by a worthy contemporary, but there seems to be here so much more and an addition of the critical element which must arrest

the attention of the scholar apart from the lover of our Blessed Lady, every feature of whose life, as reflected in the history of the Church, must have an attraction for the educated Catholic.

The work which our author has done is thoroughly original. He has gathered into an annual all the feasts of the Blessed Virgin kept in the various churches of the East and West, not excluding the schismatical and heretical sects which have at any time paid special honor to the Mother of our Lord. The object, peculiar rite, and succinct history of each feast are stated, without any attempt at ascetical exposition. It stands to reason that amid so much matter which had to be gathered from ancient and foreign sources there should be some things which might give rise to difficulties if their liturgical authority were questioned; nor does the author claim to present a selection wholly free from defects which a captious critic might take exception to, but we believe the work would have lost much of the pleasant interest, which the quaint traditions and local coloring give it, were the rule of liturgical authenticity or historic fact applied exclusively. Indeed it may be justly said that such a criterion would, next to being undesirable, be probably also impossible or at least impracticable since facts not vouched for do not cease to be facts unless in the eyes of a judicial court, and Fr. H. pretends only to offer what is worthy of credit.

A BRIEF TEXT-BOOK OF LOGIC AND MENTAL PHILOSOPHY. By Rev. Charles Coppens, S. J.—New York: The Cath. Publication Society Co., 1892.

The physical sciences have gained considerably in our day from having been made accessible to the young by easy methods in popular text-books. The same can hardly be said of mental philosophy which, amidst the universal interest called forth by the revival of the scholastic method and its adaptation to modern science, has still left the young student at the old disadvantage of a difficult and unattractive beginning. The Latin text-books placed in the hands of the youth who commences the study of philosophy are a strain upon his mental faculties which it takes a long time before he becomes accustomed to. For weeks and months the science by which he is to learn how to think engages his memory only and presents to him the vaguest outline of the field he is to master.

Formerly English text-books were supposed to be impracticable because the study in Latin greatly facilitates the right use of abstract terms which must be expressed by circumlocution in the vernacular. This difficulty, it was foreseen, would grow less in course of time, as the English language was being endowed more and more by its Latin parent weakening the exclusive hold of the Saxon. The Stonyhurst Manuals gave decided proof that it was possible to make the study of logic as well as metaphysics popular and accessible to those who did not read the language of St. Thomas and the schools. Nevertheless the Stonyhurst Manuals were not text-books

for the student. They helped him to an easier mastery of the practical value of the study in philosophy, but they were not digested for the study in school.

Father Coppens has gone further. He has ventured to give us a school-text which gathers into a small compass the concise definitions, principles and rules found in standard class-books such as Liberatore, Zigliara, Van der Aa, and others of equal authority.

The modest volume consists of two parts. The first, covering nearly a hundred pages, embraces dialectics and critical logic. The second, somewhat over a hundred and seventy-eight, deals with mental philosophy, including ontology, cosmology, psychology and natural theology.

This, we fancy, will be delightful news to our young college and seminary students, especially those who have already had some taste of the "saxa scalebrosa," on which the speculative handmaid of theology is enthroned.

As to the manner in which Fr. Coppens has done the work we cannot praise it sufficiently. The difficulties of condensing, of being clear, of separating principles from opinions and of preserving an intelligent connection of the arguments which go to make the structure of mental philosophy complete must appeal to anyone who has made a course of philosophy according to the usual methods. Fr. Coppens has brought exceptional preparation to the task imposed by this work in his previous works which lead in a manner up to it by the process adopted through a time-honored and efficient system of study in the college curriculum. The student of rhetoric will readily follow in the traces marked out by familiar lines in the treatise on logic both dialectic and critical. This we consider the most difficult portion of the work when we compare it with such works as Whately's which propose to cover the same ground and for a similar purpose.

In the chapters on mental philosophy one might select points which in the critic's eyes lay particular stress on views permitting differences of position. Yet such differences are for the most part only slight and to emphasize them would do discredit to anyone who should do so. An instance in point is the view which Fr. Coppens takes of the Darwinian theory, which latter may be defended on Catholic ground, although for our own part we should rather warn the student against its advocacy as the author emphatically does. Most teachers will have made the experience that the young disciple, when told that an apparently dangerous theory is capable of being defended with certain discrimination, is apt to forget the distinction, and remember only that the theory itself could be maintained. There is a certain chivalry which makes the inexperienced take up the wrong side of a subject, because it has a right side as well, and the innate tendency of championing what is novel has a peculiar charm for the novice in the intellectual field. Father Coppens' book will be a safe, a very safe guide and a very easy one, considering the subject matter for young students of philosophy. Their Latin text books will be the better understood and appreciated for this help, of which we urge everyone who may begin the study of philosophy to avail

himself at once. Indeed we have not the slightest misgiving that the small manual will prove a most valuable aid both to those who pursue the two years course, and much more to others who can devote only one year to it, or who, having failed in the thorough mastery of a system of philosophy heretofore, are anxious to supply the loss at the least possible cost of time and severe application.

THE CEREMONIES OF SOME ECCLESIASTICAL FUNCTIONS. By the Rev. Daniel O'Loan, Dean of Maynooth College, Dublin: Browne & Nolan, New York, Cincinnati, St. Louis: Benziger Bros.

The difference between this collection of Ecclesiastical ceremonies and that of the Baltimore Ceremonial commonly used by the American clergy is, that it takes the more prominent functions for which a priest is apt to have to consult authority and treats them in the practical light of present circumstances and with reference to the various decisions of the S. Congregations and the modifications introduced by the necessities of missionary countries generally. The omission of the ceremonies of Low Mass and of certain exceptional pontifical functions detracts in no wise from the completeness of the work since the omitted portions are usually treated in separate manuals or supplied by the professional master of ceremonies.

We have in the first part: Solemn Mass with Asperges and Solemn Vespers. Next: Solemn Requiem Office and Mass. In the third part the principal ceremonies connected with the Blessed Sacrament are grouped together. This portion contains many practical solutions of liturgical doubts at which the author arrives by fair reasoning from analogy wherever no special provision is made by the Ritual or decisions of the S. Congregations. The remaining part of the book treats of the ceremonies for the various feast-days during the year and in an appendix gives directions for assisting at a Bishop's private Mass.

Among other points of importance which our author treats in a way which will satisfy many who have probably been in the dark hitherto as to the proper mode of action is the case of the Forty Hours' Prayer where it is impossible to have Solemn, or even what is termed an ordinary High Mass. We give the author's words as a fair sample of the way in which he deals with questions of this kind.

"The Instruction lays down precise rules regarding the Mass to be celebrated on each of the three days included in the Forty Hours. It supposes, however, that each Mass will be celebrated solemnly . . . or that it shall, at least, be sung by the celebrant assisted by a choir. But as in very many places in this country, and in others similarly situated, it is impossible to have either a solemn Mass or a *missa cantata* on occasion of the Forty Hours' Devotion, it will be necessary to indicate the modifications in the Instruction which these circumstances call for." The author then points out what the Instruction enjoins and afterwards assumes, from

analogy, the general principles of the Liturgy, and various decisions, the case of a church where Mass cannot be celebrated solemnly, as indicated above. "Here," he says, "two cases are to be distinguished. Either the days of exposition, or any of them, admit of *private votive Masses*, or they do not. (Private votive Masses are forbidden on all Sundays or feasts of double rite; during the octaves of Christmas, Epiphany and Pentecost, Corpus Christi, on Ash Wednesday and in Holy Week, the eves of Christmas, Epiphany and Pentecost, All Souls'.) In the former hypothesis a votive Mass of the Blessed Sacrament should be celebrated on the first and third days, and on the intermediate day a votive Mass *pro pace* or for any other necessity, according to the directions of the Bishop of the place.

"These Masses since they enjoy no privileges over ordinary Masses, are subject to precisely the same rules in their celebration. The *Gloria* and *Credo* are always omitted, the last Gospel is the beginning of St. John, and at least three prayers must be said, while none of the prescribed prayers can be omitted.

"In the latter hypothesis—that is, when a private votive Mass cannot be said on one or more of the days of exposition—the Mass of the day must be said with a commemoration of the Blessed Sacrament. This commemoration must be omitted however on doubles of the first and second class, on Palm Sunday, and the eves of Christmas and Pentecost. Its place, when made, is after all the prayers prescribed by the rubrics, but before such as may be ordered by a Bishop—*orationes imperatae*."

It will appear from what has been said that Fr. O'Loan's exposition of the ceremonies is not without its special purpose and utility. A good index and the general style of typography make it further a welcome contribution to the liturgical library of the English speaking priest and seminarist. It has the "Imprimatur" of the Archbishop of Dublin.

THE CONFESSOR AFTER GOD'S OWN HEART. From the French of the Third Edition of Rev. L. J. M. Cros, S. J.—Browne & Nolan: Dublin, 1892.

The volume before us contains the principles of Catholic theology concerning the administration of the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist. It belongs to that class of works which, half ascetical, half controversial in character, have a strong local coloring. It is from beginning to end an avowed refutation of Jansenism. This, we regret to say, renders the English translation—whatever need the original may fill for certain sections of the French clergy—devoid of the practical value which it might otherwise have and which its title leads us to expect. The rigorism of Jansen, Duvergier and Arnold with the whole train of their most lax following have long ago been forgotten if ever it has had any hold upon the large portion of the English speaking clergy for whom translations of such works as this are usually intended. A book therefore which opens with a chapter on